

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

BARNES REVIEW HOLOCAUST HANDBOOK SERIES • VOLUME 18

AUSCHWITZ LIES

LEGENDS, LIES & PREJUDICES ON THE HOLOCAUST



GERMAR RUDOLF • CARLO MATTOGNO

PUBLISHED BY THE BARNES REVIEW

AUSCHWITZ LIES

**LEGENDS, LIES & PREJUDICES
ON THE HOLOCAUST**

Germar Rudolf
Carlo Mattogno

Auschwitz
Lies

Legends, Lies, and Prejudices
on the Holocaust

PUBLISHED BY THE BARNES REVIEW
P.O. BOX 15877
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20003

HOLOCAUST HANDBOOKS, vol. 18:

By Germar Rudolf & Carlo Mattogno:

Auschwitz Lies. Legends, Lies, and Prejudices on the Holocaust

The contributions by C. Mattogno (Italian) were translated by Henry Gardner, the contributions by Germar Rudolf (German) by Michael Humphrey, Carlos Porter, and by himself.

Second, slightly revised edition, July 2011

Washington, DC: THE BARNES REVIEW

P.O. Box 15877, Washington, D.C. 20003, USA

ISBN10: 0-9846312-6-7

ISBN13: 978-0-9846312-6-1

ISSN: 1529-7748

Published by THE BARNES REVIEW

Manufactured in the United States of America

© Germar Rudolf and Carlo Mattogno 2005, 2011

Distribution USA/America: TBR Books, The
Barnes Review,
P.O. Box 15877,
Washington, D.C. 20003, USA
1-877-773-9077

Distribution Europe/Africa: Castle Hill
Publishers, PO Box 243,
Uckfield, TN22 9AW, UK

Set in Times New Roman.

www.BarnesReview.com

www.HolocaustHandbooks.com

If these sites are inaccessible, try an anonymizing website

ON THE COVER: Background: Auschwitz Crematorium II. Top photo: a fanciful illustration by Auschwitz inmate David Olere whose sketches, though laden with massive exaggeration and error, are accepted as accurate by mainstream historians. Bottom left: One of the alleged “holes of death.”

Bottom right: One of the reconstructed holes in the ceiling through which Zyklon-B gas pellets allegedly were dropped into this “gas chamber.” The room was reconstructed in 1947 to include details such as this that were not in the original plans, obviously to make it look like the room was used for gassing Jews to death.

Table of Contents

Introduction

By Germar Rudolf

Pressac: From Paul to Pseudo-Saul

By Germar Rudolf

Fantasies of a Biochemist

By Germar Rudolf

Polish Pseudo-Scientists 45

By Germar Rudolf

Green sees Red

By Germar Rudolf

An Accountant Poses as Cremation Expert

By Carlo Mattogno

Professor Perjury

By Germar Rudolf

Denying Evidence

By Carlo Mattogno

The International Auschwitz Controversy 271

By Germar Rudolf

The Elusive Holes of Death

By Carlo Mattogno

Index of Names

Introduction

By Germar Rudolf

End of 1991, U.S. citizen Bradley R. Smith with his “Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust” (CODOH) caused a storm in a teapot with ads placed in student newspapers at various colleges and universities. These ads challenged the mainstream opinion on “the Holocaust.”^[1] The editors of the student newspapers which ran Smith’s ads were massively attacked for allegedly “spreading hate.” Even two of the leading daily newspapers of the United States commented on Smith’s advertisement campaigns. An analysis of these articles may serve as an introduction to the topic of this book.

Here is what *The Washington Post* had to say about Smith’s ad:^[2]

“The ad copy is just the sort that puts people’s free-speech convictions to flight: vile, straight-faced fabrications about ‘the good news of Holocaust Revisionism’ in full-page ads submitted recently to a wide range of college newspapers. In the ads, yet another group of haters presents artfully pseudo-academic assurances that no mass murder took place at Auschwitz, that eyewitness accounts are ‘ludicrously unreliable,’ that ‘it is now well documented’ (a lie) that confessions at war crimes trials were obtained through torture. Most insidious, the ad’s author attributes any dissension from the ‘Holocaust Story’ to ‘political correctness’ and ‘campus Thought Police,’ adroitly appropriating political symbols of the moment.

College newspapers have no obligation to accept these ads, of course, and some editors haven’t. Some, however, including those at Duke and Rutgers, have run them with rebuttals and discussion. This has brought an outcry from adults calling for an across-the-board ban on such material under existing guidelines that ban racist or antisemitic copy. The catch, though, is the false dispassionate and pseudo-scholarly tone of the ads, which studiously avoid code words and ethnic invective. Their offensiveness lies solely in their message.

Statements that the Holocaust never happened have surfaced in a variety of semi-public contexts lately – computer networks, talk radio – and, whether from the efforts of a small band of poisonous thinkers or

from the gradual erosion of a taboo, it's clear that such talk is becoming gradually more audible in public discourse. As a social development, this is not good news. But the idea that the way to combat these ads is to suppress them – automatically and in every case – is bad strategy. It plays into a key part of the offenders' argument: that evidence of the Holocaust is somehow sparse or hard to come by and that the truth has anything to fear from scrutiny.

The opposite is true. Poland is open now. Anyone can go to Auschwitz and see the roomfuls of grisly, literal evidence. Anyone can read not one, or 10, but hundreds of volumes of documents. Anyone can demolish the supposedly academic 'rise' laid out in these ads without half trying – and everyone has a responsibility to do so, given the chances. The student editors at Duke and Rutgers did this. The impulse to push away the creeping revisionist insinuation, to protect it from the bracing blast of refutation, is shortsighted. Ironically, one sole sentence near the beginning of the ad copy is in fact correct: 'Students should be encouraged to investigate the Holocaust story the same way they are encouraged to investigate every other historical event.'

Anyone reading Bradley Smith's books *Confessions of a Holocaust Revisionist*[\[3\]](#) or *Break my Bones*[\[4\]](#) can easily find out that he is anything else but a hater. These books also prove that Smith's dispassionate style is not at all "false." Furthermore, he never claimed himself or his ads to be "scholarly" or "academic," which is why he cannot be a "pseudo-" either.

In addition, why should it be deplorable that a historical taboo is challenged or eroding? Isn't it one of the main characteristics of tyrannies that they try to shield certain historical and political issues from criticism by declaring them a taboo? And what exactly is it that makes a thinker "poisonous"? Just the fact that he thinks the unthinkable, the unwanted? Isn't it exactly that which made Socrates a great philosopher?

Also, the claim that what Smith wrote are "vile, straight-faced fabrications," "creeping insinuations," and "a lie" is not only unsupported, but a lie in itself. In a 1986 book the captors of Rudolf Höss, former commandant of Auschwitz, admitted how they tortured him in order to receive confessions from him intended to be used during the post-war trials.
[\[5\]](#)

Or simply read what British journalist Alan Moorehead reported on what was going on in allied prisons in Germany after the war in preparation of the

infamous war crimes trials:[\[6\]](#)

“As we approached the cells of the SS guards, the [British] sergeant’s language become ferocious. ‘We had had an interrogation this morning,’ the captain said. ‘I am afraid they are not a pretty sight.’ [...] The sergeant unbolted the first door and [...] strode into the cell, jabbing a metal spike in front of him. ‘Get up,’ he shouted. ‘Get up. Get up, you dirty bastards.’ There were half a dozen men lying or half lying on the floor. One or two were able to pull themselves erect at once. The man nearest me, his shirt and face spattered with blood, made two attempts before he got on to his knees and then gradually on to his feet. He stood with his arms stretched out in front of him, trembling violently.

‘Come on. Get up,’ the sergeant shouted [in the next cell]. The man was lying in his blood on the floor, a massive figure with a heavy head and bedraggled beard [...] ‘Why don’t you kill me?’ he whispered. ‘Why don’t you kill me? I cannot stand it any more.’ The same phrases dribbled out of his lips over and over again. ‘He’s been saying that all morning, the dirty bastard,’ the sergeant said.”

And if that is still not enough, here is what Edward L. van Roden and Gordon Simpson had to say about these procedures. Van Roden served in World War II as Chief of the Military Justice Division for the European Theater. Together with Justice Gordon Simpson of the Texas Supreme Court, van Roden was appointed in 1948 to an extraordinary commission charged with investigating the claims of abuse during U.S. trials in Germany. Here is an excerpt of what van Roden wrote:[\[7\]](#)

“AMERICAN investigators at the U. S. Court in Dachau, Germany, used the following methods to obtain confessions: Beatings and brutal kickings. Knocking out teeth and breaking jaws. Mock trials. Solitary confinement. Posturing as priests. Very limited rations. Spiritual deprivation. Promises of acquittal. [...] We won the war, but some of us want to go on killing. That seems to me wicked. [...] The American prohibition of hearsay evidence had been suspended. Second and third-hand testimony was admitted, [...] Lt Perl of the Prosecution pleaded that it was difficult to obtain competent evidence. Perl told the court, ‘We had a tough case to crack and we had to use persuasive methods.’ He admitted to the court that the persuasive methods included various ‘expedients, including some violence and mock trials.’ He further told the court that the cases rested on statements obtained by such methods. [...] The statements which were

admitted as evidence were obtained from men who had first been kept in solitary confinement for three, four, and, five months. They were confined between four walls, with no windows, and no opportunity of exercise. Two meals a day were shoved in to them through a slot in the door. They were not allowed to talk to anyone. They had no communication with their families or any minister or priest during that time. [...] Our investigators would put a black hood over the accused's head and then punch him in the face with brass knuckles, kick him, and beat him with rubber hose. Many of the German defendants had teeth knocked out. Some had their jaws broken. All but two of the Germans, in the 139 cases we investigated, had been kicked in the testicles beyond repair. This was Standard Operating Procedure with American investigators. Perl admitted use of mock trials and persuasive methods including violence and said the court was free to decide the weight to be attached to evidence thus received. But it all went in.

One 18 year old defendant, after a series of beatings, was writing a statement being dictated to him. When they reached the 16th page, the boy was locked up for the night. In the early morning, Germans in nearby cells heard him muttering. 'I will not utter another lie.' When the jailer came in later to get him to finish his false statement, he found the German hanging from a cell bar, dead. However the statement that the German had hanged himself to escape signing was offered and received in evidence in the trial of the others.

Sometimes a prisoner who refused to sign was led into a dimly lit room, where a group of civilian investigators, wearing U. S. Army uniforms, were seated around a black table with a crucifix in the center and two candles burning, one on each aide. 'You will now have your American trial,' the defendant was told.

The sham court passed a sham sentence of death. Then the accused was told, 'You will hang in a few days, as soon as the general approves this sentence: but in the meantime sign this confession and we can get you acquitted.' Some still wouldn't sign. [...]

In another case, a bogus Catholic priest (actually an investigator) entered the cell of one of the defendants, heard his confession, gave him absolution, and then gave him a little friendly tip: 'Sign whatever the investigators ask you to sign. It will get you your freedom. Even though it's false, I can give you absolution now in advance for the lie you'd tell.'"

Or take, for a change, the methods used in communist countries to obtain testimonies in war crime trials:[\[8\]](#)

“One of the witnesses involved in the 1962 case stated that he was threatened by an investigator ‘with a pistol.’ A second witness testified that he had incriminated Niznansky ‘under psychological and physical duress.’ Jan Holbus, another witness for the prosecution back in 1962, declared during his interrogation in 2001 that he was threatened that he ‘will leave the room with his feet first,’ if he does not testify as the prosecution expects him to.”

Torture “a lie”? Who is lying here? And how can testimonies obtained that way be anything else but “ludicrously unreliable?”

Haters cannot be recognized by the content of their message, but by their style, by the choice of words. The foremost indicator of hate are hateful, unfounded expressions, like “vile, straight-faced fabrications,” “group of haters,” “a lie,” “insidious,” “false dispassionate,” “pseudo-academic,” “pseudo-scholarly,” “small band of poisonous thinkers” “creeping insinuation.” There you have a hater – writing in the *Washington Post*.

Next on my list is an article published in *The New York Times*:[\[9\]](#)

“Bradley Smith is a Californian who acknowledges that the Nazis were cruel to Jews but who denies that the Holocaust ever happened. He has tried to expound his views in a 4,000-word essay submitted as an advertisement to several college newspapers – giving headaches and heartaches to student editors. In the process he gives the public some valuable, if unintended, lessons in the workings of a free press.

Many readers would blanch if they came upon Mr. Smith’s pseudo-scholarly tract. Yes, he concedes, Jews were mistreated by the Nazis, and ‘many tragically perished in the maelstrom.’ But the idea that Nazi Germany exterminated six million Jews, Mr. Smith contends, is an irresponsible exaggeration. Gas chambers? A myth. Those actually were ‘life-saving’ fumigation shelters to delouse clothing and prevent disease.

Should college editors risk appearing mercenary by taking money for publishing such trash? Should they risk playing censors to protect other young minds by refusing the ad? Is there some middle course, like printing the ad but with appraisals of its bizarre musings?

The dilemma is acute, just as it can be for commercial newspapers when confronted with ads that offend decency, patriotism or commonly accepted history. But the first lesson here is that it is their dilemma and

not a First Amendment question. That great ordinance directs that Congress make no law abridging free expression. Government may not censor Mr. Smith and his fellow ‘Holocaust revisionists,’ no matter how intellectually barren their claims. Whether to publish their ads is something for the newspapers to decide.

The second lesson is that there’s probably no right answer to the question of how they should decide. College editors have come out in different ways. Newspapers at Harvard, Yale, Brown and the University of California turned the ad down. Those at Cornell, Duke, Northwestern and Michigan printed it, sometimes citing free speech.

Perhaps the most creative response was that of the student editors at Rutgers University. The Daily Targum newspaper rejected the Holocaust tract as advertising but ran the text in its news columns, along with an editorial denunciation and comment by invited authors. The editors thus transformed revulsion into education.

The public does not usually require protection from bad ideas. Even so, initial instincts in favor of publication may sometimes yield to exceptions, against quackery, for instance, or on behalf of taste or fairness. The Times, for instance, has from time to time refused advertisements – like one insisting that a politician killed in a plane crash had himself sabotaged the flight; that claim seemed unjustly unanswerable.

Denying the Holocaust may be monumentally more unjust. Yet to require that it be discussed only within approved limits may do an even greater injustice to the memory of its victims. To print or not to print? The diversity of responses from diverse editors demonstrates something more important than the answer. When there is free expression, even the ugliest ideas enrich democracy.”

There is much less hate in these lines than in those printed by the *Washington Post*. The usual misplaced accusation of being “pseudo-scholarly,” denigrating dissenting opinions as “trash” or mere “bizarre musings” is as bad as it gets. Much finer are the psychological slip-ups of this author. For example, why is there even a need to consider whether or not to “protect other young minds” from dissenting historical views? And why exactly is it a “creative response” to address revisionist writings with “editorial denunciation and comment”? Denunciations and comments are not exactly a scholarly refutation.

Such tolerance by the *New York Times*, however, did not last very long. After Bradley Smith had made various advertisement campaigns with alternating success for more than ten years, the leading editors of the *New York Times* finally decided that they had enough of it. They came to the conclusion that the First Amendment is not a good thing after all. They decided to teach all student editors a lesson that they had a moral obligation to suppress revisionist dissent. Arthur Sulzberger, publisher of the *New York Times*, as well as Abraham Foxman, President of the Jewish Anti-Defamation League, two of the most influential men in American culture and politics, joined together in 2003 to personally put an end to Smith's work at the universities. The Anti-Defamation League pronounced:[\[10\]](#)

“When a campus newspaper editor is asked to print an ad denying that the Holocaust took place – or calling for ‘open debate’ on the subject – can he or she say ‘no’ without compromising freedom of the press?”

In the view of the ADL and The New York Times, the answer is yes. Both organizations have been disturbed by the continuing – and often successful – attempts by Holocaust deniers [...] to place advertisements and other materials in campus newspapers. Out of their common concern came an annual colloquium, ‘Extremism Targets the Campus Press: Balancing Freedom and Responsibility.’

‘We seek to educate campus journalists,’ said ADL Campus Affairs/Higher Education Director Jeffrey Ross, ‘to balance freedom of the press with responsibility of the press when responding to hate submissions.’”

So now we know it for sure: Revisionism is hate. Period. Even if presented dispassionately and without invectives. It is hate because it is hated. And it is hated because after more than ten years of trying it finally must have dawned on these haters from the *New York Times* and the ADL that revisionist arguments cannot be refuted. *The Washington Post's* claim about “roomfuls of grisly evidence” at Auschwitz, they must have come to see, is nothing but a collection of trivial wartime memorabilia, and the “hundreds of volumes of documents” referred to in the same article in the meantime turned out to support revisionist claims.

Truth is hate for those who hate the truth. And those who call for censorship against peaceful, well-behaved dissenters are without any doubt haters – and intentional obfuscators, which is just another word for liars. Because those who tell only one side of a story and deliberately hide the

other know that they are not telling the entire truth or no truth at all. Such people are called liars.

* * *

The term “Auschwitz Lie” was coined by a German war veteran named Thies Christophersen who had been stationed at an experimental farm at the village of Harmense near Auschwitz during the war. In 1973 Christophersen published a brochure, in which he described his experiences. He claimed that during his time at Auschwitz he never heard or saw anything about mass murder against Jews. The title of his anecdotal brochure made history:

The Auschwitz Lie[\[11\]](#)

Of course, with this term Christophersen meant the exact opposite of what is generally meant by it today. Whereas Christophersen maintained that the claim of mass extermination at Auschwitz is a lie, today claims like that spread by Christophersen are decried as “the Auschwitz lie.”[\[12\]](#)

Fact is that the term “Auschwitz Lie” has become a part of the German as well as the English language. And it is also a fact that lies are continuously being spread about Auschwitz to an extreme degree.

The term lie itself requires an explanation. In the more narrow sense, this is the intentional expression or dissemination of something that is knowingly untrue. In order to be a liar, it does not suffice to distribute something that is not true, because most untruths are spread without malice, because it is assumed to be the truth.

But then there is something that I want to call “intentional lack of knowledge.” All those who spread a false claim, even though it would be their obligation to have the knowledge that it is untrue, are guilty of this offense against truthfulness. These individuals are not intentional liars, but liars due to crass carelessness. For instance, I call an expert a careless liar, who spreads untrue claims about an important topic of his field of expertise, even though he should have the expert knowledge to know that it is not true – or at least he could easily find out – and has the professional duty to find out – that it is untrue.

The present book is a compilation of various papers written over the past eleven years either by Italian revisionist scholar Carlo Mattogno or by me, a German revisionist scholar currently residing in the United States. They all deal with articles or books written by authors, which are opposed to the

revisionist interpretation of what is generally referred to as “the Holocaust” in general and with what did or did not happen at Auschwitz in particular. Some of our papers have been published before, either in printed form or only online, some of them in English, others only in German or Italian. Since one of the most important aspects of an academic dispute is the discussion of opposing views, we decided to update the most important of our papers and publish them in printed form. This gives the reader an opportunity to find in one volume a whole range of topics and disputes covered from a revisionist point of view. It may serve as a hallmark of the depth and quality of revisionist arguments and also of the superiority of our interpretation over that of the “orthodox” historians.

Quite a few of the papers and books criticized in this volume have been announced as “definite refutation” of revisionist arguments by the media or by their authors themselves. It is the goal of this book to emphasize that nothing could be farther from the truth. In fact, after perusing this book, the reader will understand that the attempts in refuting revisionist arguments dealt with in this book were utter failures without a single exception.

A similar edition of this book appeared a few weeks ago in the German language, consisting exclusively of contributions authored by me.[\[13\]](#) Some of the papers included in the German edition have not been included in this volume, because they address works that appeared only in the German language and are thus not available to the reader unfamiliar with that language. Those who can read German are highly recommended to read those papers as well. For those who cannot read German, I may briefly summarize them here.

The political importance of some of the German papers I scrutinized in the German edition of this book results from the fact that the German government has quoted them as proof for their (false) claim that my own research results on Auschwitz (or those by Fred Leuchter,[\[14\]](#) whose work preceded mine) are incorrect, so for instance in 2002 the yearly report of the German “Office for the Protection of the Constitution.”[\[15\]](#)

One of the first papers to critically address revisionist arguments about forensic aspects of Auschwitz was authored by Hellmuth Auerbach, a historian from Germany’s official Institute for Contemporary History in Munich.[\[16\]](#) In this brief paper, which claims to refute the technical and chemical arguments of the revisionist *Leuchter Report* regarding Auschwitz, Auerbach makes several claims, none of which he backs up with any

evidence. Since most of the issues he addresses are of technical nature, for which he cannot claim to have any expert knowledge, it cannot surprise that his unfounded claims are untenable.[\[17\]](#)

Two years after H. Auerbach, Werner Wegner authored a paper[\[18\]](#) also trying to refute the *Leuchter Report*.¹⁴ The only expert knowledge this 90 year old geriatric had, however, was as a social worker. Hence, it is not surprising that his article was not just devoid of any evidence supporting his historical as well as his technical claims, but also so much off the mark with many of its ludicrous claims that merely reading his paper made my hair stand up straight.[\[19\]](#) That such a dilettantish work is quoted by government officials¹⁵ and by mainstream historians[\[20\]](#) in the first place is an indication how desperate they really are to quote just about anything which claims to refute revisionist arguments.

At the end of 1991, Austrian chemist Dr. Josef Bailer critiqued the *Leuchter Report* in a little booklet published in Austria.[\[21\]](#) In it, Bailer assumes that the claimed homicidal gassings at Auschwitz were performed with extremely low amounts of poison, resulting in long execution times. Fact is, however, that all witnesses confirming such gassings reported about very short execution times, requiring high poison amounts. Dr. Bailer also exhibited an astounding lack of understanding of the chemical process involved when hydrogen cyanide (the poisonous compound of Zyklon B) reacts with masonry. As the lack of references clearly shows, he did not even bother to consult any expert literature on the topic. Despite criticism directed at his study,[\[22\]](#) Bailer repeated his unsustainable objections in later publications, without responding to his critics and again without any effort to consult the most basic chemical standard literature.[\[23\]](#) Dr. Bailer's argument ran something like that: He could not see a way, how hydrogen cyanide could react with masonry to form long-term stable compounds (Iron Blue). Therefore, any such compound found today in masonry, which was once exposed to Zyklon B gas, cannot originate from this gas. It must have another origin, like for example wall paint. The problem with this approach is that Dr. Bailer did not even try to look into the various ways hydrogen cyanide does react with masonry. He also studiously ignored all of the evidence presented to him clearly showing that a) there are possible reactions leading to such long-term stable compounds, and b) that the compounds found in masonry in Auschwitz cannot possibly stem from wall paint. This is so because a) this type of wall paint did not exist, b) these compounds can be found also within

the wall, c) there is no paint layer on the walls, to name only a few facts refuting Dr. Bailer's claim.[24] Dr. Bailer's nonsense about the wall paint was subsequently not only quoted as "proof" that I am wrong by German authorities,¹⁵ but was also a justification for a team of Polish scientists to exclude from their analysis the long-term stable compounds at issue. I deal with those Polish scientists in the chapter "Polish Pseudo-Scientists" in the present book. As such, Dr. Bailer's impact was considerable.

Even more bold were the lies spread by the German Press Agency (*Deutsche Presseagentur*, dpa) in a press release on March 29, 1994. Contrary to all well-established scientific facts about the extreme long-term stability of the compounds under investigation here, this press release claimed:[25]

"Cyanide compounds decompose very quickly. In the ground, this occurs even after six to eight weeks; in masonry, these compounds could only be preserved under 'absolute conditions of conservation including complete exclusion of air and bacteria.'"

Inquiries with the dpa press office in Stuttgart which published the report revealed that the writer responsible for the report, Albert Meinecke, had simply invented this alleged "expert opinion." [26] This obvious lie continues to be disseminated by German and foreign media [27] as well as by German government agencies such as, for example, the Bavarian Ministry of the Interior. [28]

In summer of 1991, German physician and writer Till Bastian addressed revisionist arguments on a more general level with two major articles published in the German weekly newspaper *Die Zeit*. [29] It was triggered by the growing prominence of the *Leuchter Report*, the reputation of which Bastian intended to destroy. Whereas the first article mainly consists of innuendoes and political name-calling against revisionists, the second article focuses on some technical and historical arguments. However, Bastian's arguments are rather superficial, [30] for he followed the arguments outlined by the equally superficial Hellmuth Auerbach.¹⁶ Even though Bastian later augmented his argument with an extended edition published as a small booklet, it added little to the depth of his argument. [31] Despite its poor historical quality, this booklet was quite a success due to its small size and probably also because of its cheap, politically correct polemics.

In 1996, Markus Tiedemann, a German student of philosophy, published a book intended as a guideline for history teachers to refute revisionist arguments. [32] Tiedemann's book is full of polemics, innuendoes, unfounded

and untrue statements about revisionism, and unsupported and false historical claims.[33] Should any teacher ever try to use this book to refute revisionist arguments, he would quickly suffer total shipwreck if facing a real revisionist. Despite the fact that this book is totally worthless from a historical point of view, it won the German prize “*Das politische Buch*” (the political book) in 1998. Hence, it was praised because of its political usefulness to denigrate and defame revisionism. Due to its success, it was republished by several other publishers under license in 2000[34] and with support of the German Social-Democratic Party,[35] which at that time dominated the German federal government.

Another much more serious and competent opponent of revisionism is retired German professor for the history of ideologies Dr. Ernst Nolte. In 1993 he wrote a book on current and upcoming controversies about National Socialism.[36] A major part of this book addresses revisionist arguments on the Holocaust in an attempt to refute them. In contrast to all other works that appeared so far and which claimed to refute Holocaust revisionist arguments, this is the only one that abstains from political name-calling and innuendoes. Nolte is also the only mainstream scholar who publicly admits that revisionists have a right to doubt and to critically challenge the orthodox view. He even goes so far as to maintain that revisionist works on the Holocaust are superior to those of mainstream historiography.[37] In a later publication he indicated that he has even moved a little closer to revisionism in that he accepts certain revisionist arguments and conclusions as inescapable in the light of the existing evidence.[38] This lack of hostility toward revisionism and the revisionists has caused Prof. Nolte much distress. After all, lack of contempt for revisionism is punished with massive contempt by media and politics in return. The level and quality of Nolte’s argument is to some degree comparable to that of M. Shermer and A. Grobman as discussed by Carlo Mattogno in this volume – minus the polemics of the latter. Including an English translation of my response to Dr. Nolte[39] would therefore have been a duplication of arguments. We therefore decided not to reproduce it here.

Also omitted was my response to German mainstream journalist Fritjof Meyer, who in 2002 triggered a controversy about the claimed mass murder at Auschwitz by decommissioning the Birkenau crematoria as sites of mass murder and by drastically reducing the Auschwitz death toll to roughly half a million. However, as a probably even more valuable replacement, an article

of mine was included, which widened the scope and range of the topic by focusing on the currently latest outcrop of this controversy after it had spilled into the English speaking world with a paper published in the journal *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* in 2004. This article of mine in the present book under the title “The International Auschwitz Controversy” also includes references to all scholarly papers known to me about this controversies, most of which are available in English as well.

Not included in this volume either was Dutch-Jewish professor for cultural history Robert Jan van Pelt. Several responses of Carlo Mattogno and of mine to van Pelt’s work were published before, to which I may direct the reader’s attention.[\[40\]](#) Since van Pelt’s most recent work on Auschwitz[\[41\]](#) is also the most comprehensive, it deserves more than a mere response in a simple article. We therefore decided to dedicate an entire book to refuting van Pelt, a project which is still in progress as I write these lines.[\[42\]](#)

* * *

The pen is mightier than the sword, and for this reason propaganda lies are the most powerful weapons in the hands of governments. When it comes to refuting or merely attacking revisionism, political zeal and fanaticism go rampant. Propaganda lies against revisionism and revisionists are therefore widespread. As an example of an especially vicious lie I would like to present a statement about me spread by the German federal government:[\[43\]](#)

“The actual degree of Rudolf’s ‘seriousness’ and ‘respectability’ is revealed by an article published by him in the right-wing extremist ‘Quarterly for Free Historical Research’ under the title ‘About Fear and How to Overcome it.’ In it he indirectly calls for violence against a public prosecutor highly committed to prosecuting revisionism.”

Of course, this highly respectable German government publication does not give any source for this claim, which could, after all, enable the reader to verify if this statement is true or not, and that is not what Germany’s Big Brother wants his underlings to do. I therefore may quote from my article referred to by this Orwellian German authority:[\[44\]](#)

“Mark Weber correctly stated that revisionist hunters like [public prosecutors] Hans-Heiko Klein would no longer be alive if the often described ‘danger from the right-wing’ in Germany would indeed be so huge, as media and politicians claim. [...] Indeed, that Heiko Klein is still

alive borders on a miracle and proves how harmless the entire German 'scene' really is. One certainly could not win a war of liberation with such freedom fighters. [This is sarcasm. Anyone having some humor here?]

I have been repeatedly asked to publish the full names of all persons involved in the persecution of dissidents by the authorities. After all, one never knows what good this kind of information could do in the future. That is exactly the reason why I hesitate to do this. After all the political trials and persecution, Germany really needs only one thing in the future: A large-scale amnesty, a reconciliation with itself, an end to self-flagellation and self-destruction. I am therefore strictly opposed to any kind of threat, should the table be turned one day, and then the other side will be the target. What would then be the difference between them and us? Don't count on me!"

In other words: I said the exact opposite of what the German government claimed I said: I urgently advised not to use violence against the lackeys of the German authorities, who persecute peaceful dissidents and destroy their social existence.

Hence, we have firmly established the first liar: the federal government of Germany. The exposure of the other liars follows in the upcoming chapters.

Gerhard Rudolf, Chicago, July 7, 2005

* * *

P.S.: Since each contribution to this book is independent, it was not always possible to avoid some repetitions. I have tried to reduce them to a minimum, though, and to point the reader to other contributions in this book instead.

In order to enable the reader to easily find the sources quoted in the footnotes, I have included Internet addresses of the source where known to me. The vivid fluctuations of addresses on the Internet will render several of those Internet references invalid with time. The use of search engines will help to remedy the situation in most cases.

Since some countries censor the Internet, some readers may not be able to reach some of the Internet addresses given here. In such cases I recommend to use anonymizing websites like www.anonymizer.com. With their service

you can safely surf the net without having to fear Orwellian interferences.

For reasons of restricted space, no internet addresses were given for articles from the revisionist periodicals *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* (VffG, = Quarterly for Free Historical Research) and *The Revisionist* (TR), although they are all available online. The individual papers can be reached from the respective home pages at www.vho.org/VffG and www.vho.org/tr. Most revisionist books can be downloaded for free at www.vho.org/download.

Pressac: From Paul to Pseudo-Saul

By Germar Rudolf

During the 1993 and 1994, French pharmacist Jean-Claude Pressac was heralded by European media like a heroic knight who had killed the evil revisionist dragon with its own – technical – methods.[\[45\]](#)

Serge Klarsfeld, president of the Association of Sons and Daughters of Jewish Deportees of France, characterized Jean-Claude Pressac in a preface of a rebuttal of the *Leuchter-Report* by Pressac's as a meritorious scholar considered to be one of the few specialists for the National Socialist extermination techniques in the Auschwitz camp. And this, although he almost had become a revisionist himself. But thanks to his sharp and rational intellect, he could resist the temptation of the revisionists around Prof. Robert Faurisson and managed to obey only to the demands of the truth.[\[46\]](#) That sounds quit interesting and raises the question: who exactly is this J.-C. Pressac that he managed to go the way from a scientific proximity to revisionism to the flagship of their opponents so effortlessly? Had he changed his mind because he was convinced he had been wrong?

When I visited Prof. Robert Faurisson in late 1991 in Vichy, he told me his side of the story – I paraphrase from the notes I made shortly thereafter:

“I had been in touch with Jean-Claude for some time, but I must tell you that it was no fun. I had to realize quickly that Jean-Claude is hardly capable of consequent, analytically thought-through and systematic scholarly work. This is already obvious with his so-called standard work. It is characterized by a complete organizational chaos. He repeats himself numerous times, mixes facts with interpretations and imputations, and even with wishful thinking. Moreover, it is intellectually dishonest not even to mention the one scholar – me – who has discovered most of the sources he relies upon and made them accessible for researchers.

Jean-Claude is mentally very unstable. This became particularly obvious when he realized more and more that my thesis about the fraudulent nature of Holocaust claims is correct. Because the result of this insight was that the confrontation with representatives of the established version become extremely tough. And even more than that: it became

outright dangerous, because I started being prosecuted and physically attacked. Jean-Claude became frightened and begged me not to exaggerate it, but instead to bring the truth to the surface only step by step.

But if I have recognized something as true, I will not tell half-truths or outright lies. We therefore parted at that point in disagreement.”

So much from the other side. Professor Faurisson did of course publish his own rebuttals to Pressac’s works, to which I point the reader’s attention.[\[47\]](#)

One may agree or disagree with Prof. Faurisson’s views. The fact is that his views do not have to contradict Serge Klarsfeld’s statement that Jean-Claude Pressac had become the foremost expert among exterminationist historians regarding the knowledge of source material on the alleged extermination techniques of Auschwitz as well as regarding his devotion and skill to address technical questions. Because if Faurisson is right that this progress still does not suffice scientific expectations, this would only shed a bad light on the quality of all the rest of exterminationist publications.

In order to support Faurisson’s judgment, I will subsequently demonstrate that Pressac failed miserably particularly with his attempt to address technical and scientific questions. As an example I will analyze the statement of the witness of the alleged mass extermination in Auschwitz, which Jean-Claude Pressac considers to be the most important and at once the most credible witness:[\[48\]](#) Henryk Tauber, who according to his own statement was a member of the stoker commando in crematorium II in Birkenau. With Tauber, Pressac makes the same mistake as with all the other witnesses he quotes: he does not subject their testimony to a technical critique. Already mere sound reasoning of an alert, but technically uneducated mind reading Tauber’s absurd lore should lead to the awareness that some skepticism is appropriate. But that does apparently not apply to Pressac.[\[49\]](#) Tauber’s absurd testimony contains the following allegations:[\[50\]](#)

“Generally speaking, we burned 4 or 5 corpses at a time in one muffle, but sometimes we charged a greater number of corpses. It was possible to charge up to 8 ‘musulmans.’ Such big charges were incinerated without the knowledge of the head of the crematorium during air-raid warnings in order to attract the attention of airmen by having a bigger fire emerging from the chimney.” (emphasis added)

The term “bigger fire” suggests that according to Tauber flames always came out of the chimney. The problem with this statement is that crematory

chimneys cannot spit out any flames.[51]

It was also impossible to put as many corpses into one muffle at a time as claimed by Tauber. Tauber claims that just one person could balance the stretcher filled with two corpses while it was pushed into the muffle, sliding over two rollers installed at the muffle door.[52] Ill. 1 shows a typical stretcher, indicating that the side rails were roughly twice as long as the area where the corpse was placed. Because the corpses spread out roughly from the middle of the stretcher to its other end, half of the weight of the corpses needed to be balanced at the end of the side rails according to the lever laws, when the stretcher was pushed deep into the muffle, that is to say, when it came to rest in its middle on the two rollers. In order to balance the weight of two corpses in a controlled manner in that situation, the person holding the stretcher at the other end needed to be heavier than both corpses together. However, the corpses on the stretcher would have been lighter than the person pushing them into the muffle with considerable certainty only, if most corpses had been victims of the typhus epidemic raging in Auschwitz at that time, because typhus victims are extreme emaciated. If, however, the corpses had been the victims of gassings, as Tauber claims, which are said to have been murdered right after their arrival in the camp, the sum of two randomly chosen corpses would quite often have exceeded the weight of the person pushing them into the muffle. Hence, Tauber's testimony about inserting two corpses by just one person indicates that those corpses were victims of the epidemic, not of murder.

Even though it would have been possible to place several corpses into a muffle by inserting them one after the other, this would have resulted in several severe thermo-technical problems:

1. The muffles of the Birkenau triple- and eight-muffle ovens were interconnected with openings in the muffle walls, through which the hot combustion air flowed (see Ill. 2). If too many corpses were piled up in the muffle, these holes would have been partly or completely blocked, slowing down or completely stopping the cremation



process in all muffles.

2. The introduction of numerous cold corpses would reduce the temperature at the beginning of the cremation so strongly that the cremation would have slowed down tremendously. The fire places of the ovens were not designed to supply that much heat.

3. Once the corpses' water had evaporated, the burning tissue of multiple corpses would have produced too much heat, severely damaging muffle, flue, and chimney.

Kurt Prüfer, an engineer of the Topf firm that constructed the Birkenau cremation ovens, testified after the war that it was indeed attempted to incinerate two corpses in a muffle at once,[\[55\]](#) probably because of the large amount of victims of the raging typhus epidemic awaiting their cremation. But the subsequent heat stress was obviously too much for the ovens. They got so severely damaged that flue and chimney had to be repaired for four months![\[56\]](#)

Tauber made another claim that is just as outrageous. He went so far as to claim that ordinary corpses were cremated without fuel, since they contained enough fat to burn by themselves:[\[57\]](#)

“During the incineration of such [not emaciated] corpses, we used the coke only to light the fire of the furnace initially, for fatty corpses burned of their own accord thanks to the combustion of the body fat. On occasion, when coke was in short supply, we would put some straw and wool in the ash bins under the muffles, and once the fat of the corpse began to burn the other corpses would catch light themselves. [...] Later on, as cremations succeeded one another, the furnaces burned thanks to the embers produced by the combustion of the corpses. So, during the



III. 2: *Openings in walls of center muffle of Buchenwald triple-muffle oven (=Birkenau ovens, highlighted with white ellipses).*

[\[54\]](#)

III. 1: *Typical corpse stretcher, here from a cremation oven of the Mauthausen camp.*[\[53\]](#)

incineration of fat bodies, the fires were generally extinguished.”

Of course, this is nonsense. Thousands of crematories all over the world consuming large amounts of energy are the best proof of that. The situation gets totally absurd when Tauber alleges that cremation trenches are more efficient than crematories, and that is why they shut them down in 1944.[\[58\]](#) The loss of energy through radiation and convection is so gigantic in open pits, if compared to proper crematory ovens, that further commentary is really not needed. Apart from the fact that cremations in open pits are never complete.

Tauber's lies become even bolder when he turns to boiling human fat:[\[59\]](#)

“Another time, the SS chased a prisoner who was not working fast enough into a pit near the crematorium [V] that was full of boiling human fat. At that time [summer 1944], the corpses were incinerated in open air pits, from which the fat flowed into a separate reservoir, dug in the ground. This fat was poured over the corpses to accelerate their combustion.”

First of all, the Birkenau camp was located in the midst of a swamp, where the ground water level was not lower than 1 m beneath the surface, despite a sophisticated drainage system. Thus, the deep pits claimed by Tauber and other witnesses would have quickly filled with water, which would have prevented any attempt of a large-scale corpse incineration in them.[\[60\]](#)

But let us assume for a moment that Tauber is correct with the claim that such incinerations were possible. However that might have worked, one thing is for sure: it would have required a hot fire, because lukewarm small fires are unsuitable to cremate corpses. The human body consists mainly of water, so a fast and complete incineration requires high temperatures. If such fires burned indeed, then the first thing that would have caught fire would have been fat pouring out of the corpses. Corpses lying within such hot open fires cannot give off fat without it immediately going up in flames. Tauber knows that very well, because he states at the same time that the fat was reused to kindle the fire and to accelerate the cremation. But if fat accelerates the cremation, it does that already at the very moment when it leaves the body. It can therefore not be lead along channels at the bottom of the pit and collected in reservoirs. Fat collects only at places where it is kept away from flames and embers and where the temperature is lower than the flash point of fat (roughly 184°C[\[61\]](#)), for example when putting meat in a pan. But I assume

that nobody would seriously claim that the corpses in Auschwitz were put into pans. After all, that would have turned them into lunchmeat, but not into ashes.

I may also indicate that open fires in pits, in which hundreds of corpses would be cremated within a few hours, as claimed by Tauber and his ilk, would generate such high temperatures in the immediate vicinity that it would have been necessary to wear suits made of asbestos to allow working close to these fires.

In other words, these passages of Tauber's testimony are nothing but invented atrocity stories with no base in truth. One does not have to be an expert to recognize this. If a scholar like Pressac still believes such a witness, after he had lied so boldly, then there is no help anymore for him.

To criticize Pressac's works thoroughly would require an entire book, and that is exactly what we revisionists have done already as early as 1995.[\[62\]](#) I therefore will restrict myself here to formal aspects of Pressac's work in order to expose Pressac's methodic weakness, if not to say his outright failure. I will do this by systematically exposing Pressac's total lack of scholarly methods based on an evaluation of his two books. The original version of this assessment was prepared in January 1994 on request of Düsseldorf defense lawyer Hajo Herrmann. It was introduced during various court proceedings in Germany as evidence (although German courts always reject any kind of evidence introduced by the defense in these matters, as they are required by law):

Expert Report on the Question of Scientific Validity of the
Books *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas
Chambers*⁴ and *Les Crématoires d'Auschwitz, la
Machinerie du meurtre de masse*[\[63\]](#) by Jean-Claude
Pressac

1. Criteria for Scientific Validity

The theses which are the subject of a scientific work must be supported by critical argumentation based on evidence in the work or by reference to sources and they must be subjected to criticism of works with opposing theses. Whether the books by Pressac given in the title meet these

requirements is discussed in what follows. When giving examples of Pressac's work, I will restrict myself to his second book, which can be seen as a systematized and updated summary of the first books. The ways Pressac argues and supports his claims is basically the same in both books.

2. Method of Proof and References to Sources

With respect to the issues of technical nature and of the exact sciences, which Pressac addresses in his work (for example, cremation, gassing with hydrogen cyanide, ventilation techniques, formation of chemical residues), he does not give any reference to sources in technical literature and also does not make his own calculations or experiments.[\[64\]](#) He merely cites some common historical works.

Examples from *Les Crématoires...*:

- On page 6 he has the SS deduce that one needs to burn 5 kg of coke for the cremation of one corpse without a coffin, based on the amount of coke required to cremate a corpse in a coffin (35 kg of wood plus a few kg of coke). This deduction is based on Pressac's estimate only, he gives no source reference.
- With respect to the amount of time it takes to cremate a corpse, Pressac quotes various contradicting figures from witness statements and documents (1 h., p. 7; 30-40 min., p. 13; 1 h. 12 min., p. 15; 15 min., p. 28; 1 h. 36 min., p. 34; 34-43 min., p. 49; 13 min., p. 72; 29 min., p. 74; 22 min., p. 80). There is no technical examination of these figures.
- On page 41f. Pressac interprets the acknowledgment by the Auschwitz camp administration of an article by G. Peters on a circulation delousing device to mean that the SS intended to equip the supposed homicidal gas chambers in Bunker 2 with a similar device. He gives no supporting evidence.
- For Pressac, the use of the German prefix “*Sonder-*” (special) is evidence of the mass-murder. He gives no evidence for this (pp. 46f.; 52; 60f.). On the contrary: on page 82 he cites the term “*Sondermaßnahme*” (special measure) used in connection with delousing operations.
- On page 70f. he interprets the fact that a wooden fan was built into a morgue as proof of the use of hydrogen cyanide in it, without giving any reason. The claim that this happened because hydrogen cyanide is corrosive is wrong, because hydrogen cyanide is less corrosive than the normal humidity in the air. He does not notice that he himself mentions in

several places that iron was rationed during the war and was replaced by other materials where possible (pp. 23; 38; 51; 53; 70).

- The data given by Pressac about the capacity of the ventilation system (pp. 30, 38, 74, 90) are not only dependent on motor performance, but also on the blower type and the layout of air ducts (pressure difference). Pressac does not provide a calculation adjusted to each of the various types of systems.

3. Criticism of Sources

Auschwitz: Technique... contains frequent and extensive criticism of witness statements, but this criticism is made without substantiation. Pressac “corrects” the statement to his own liking without giving any comprehensible reasons. In *Les Crématoires...* he once more silently corrects (again unsubstantiated) witness statements, without subjecting them to criticism. Neither work contains any critical analysis of documents. Since most of the documentation comes from formerly Soviet archives (those of the KGB, and others), criticism is surely necessary here.[\[65\]](#) Furthermore, Pressac neglects to put the documents he refers to in their broader documentary context, and many of the claims made by Pressac are not even supported by the documents he quotes as his source. He mixes his unfounded opinion with provable facts in a way that the reader without access to the source material cannot notice it. [\[66\]](#) Nor is there any technical criticism of the locations and structures under investigation (crematories or their remains).

Examples from *Les Crématoires...*:

- He restricts the gassings in crematoria I (main camp) to a few occurrences in a three month period — contrary to witness testimony (p. 34f.).
- After the gassings in Bunkers 1 and 2, he states that several hours elapsed before the corpses could be removed (p. 39f.). However, the witnesses report only a few minutes’ delay, something Pressac does not mention. He makes the same statement about Crematories IV and V, in which conveyor belt style gassings would have been impossible without a ventilation system. He is silent about witness statements to the contrary (p. 89).
- He describes the crematory capacity given in a supposedly original document as lie-propaganda and corrects it – without giving any reason (p. 80f.).

- He presents a document on the order of “indicators of hydrogen cyanide residues” for crematories as the ultimate proof of the gas chambers. However, this document exhibits so many factual impossibilities and formal errors that a documentary criticism would be mandatory. Here again Pressac omits this. On the other hand, this document does not at all mention gas chambers or a homicidal context, so that Pressac’s interpretation is premature.
- He made no study of the ruins of the site or of Allied air-reconnaissance photography.

4. Treatment of Counter Arguments

In *Auschwitz: Technique...* Pressac briefly discusses the *Leuchter Report* (without reference) and a work by P. Rassinier. He does not mention more recent and more substantial works by other authors with opposing arguments (Faurisson, Butz, Mattogno, and others). The second book contains only a suggestion that there are those who dispute his theses (p. 2), but no names, works, or arguments are given. He also omits to mention documents that might conflict with his theses (for example, air-reconnaissance photos and documents in context downright forcing a different interpretation).

Examples from *Les Crématoires...*:

- In his new book he ignores the criticisms of his first book *Auschwitz: Technique...*[\[67\]](#) On the contrary, he repeats the errors that had been pointed out to him.
- In both books he ignores the fact that there are no traces of the claimed Zyklon B insertion holes in the roof of what was supposedly the main gas chamber (morgue cellar 1, crematory II), and the fact that without them this main gas chamber disappears as a murder weapon and as the main instrument of the industrial mass-murder in Auschwitz.[\[68\]](#)
- He does not spend a single word on the chemical-physical arguments or discussions of technical issues in the *Rudolf Report*.[\[69\]](#)

5. Conclusions

Because of absence of criticism of documents, falsely claiming that documents have a certain content which they actually do not have, failure to put documents in their proper historical and documentary context, as well as deliberate alterations of witness statements, Pressac’s books have only

limited scholarly value for historiography. However, they have some informative value.

Because of lack of calculations, experiments, and other substantiation of issues of technical nature or of the exact sciences, like references to expert literature, Pressac's books do not conform to the standards that apply to scientific works in these areas. When trying to prove mass extermination in Auschwitz, Pressac always falls back on witness statements, which he fails to analyze critically and expertly.[\[70\]](#)

Finally, Pressac does not expose his conclusions to the criticism of others, especially in *Les Crématoires...* He does not even mention them.

6. Summary

The books *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* and *Les Crématoires d'Auschwitz, la Machinerie du meurtre de masse* by Jean-Claude Pressac demonstrate that the author has worked in an unscientific way. Nevertheless, because of his industrious documentary research these books contain many useful insights.

Germar Rudolf, Jettingen, January 18, 1994
revised in Chicago, December 1, 2004

Nota Bene

In May of 1993 great doings were afoot at the Max-Planck-Institute for Solid State Research in Stuttgart. One of the young PhD candidates there had become involved in a scandal, which was making news throughout Germany. The name of the PhD candidate was Germar Rudolf, the author of these lines. My scandalous activity consisted of having prepared, at the request of the legal defense of Major General Otto Ernst Remer, an expert report on the so-called "gas chambers" of Auschwitz, in which I arrived at the conclusion that it was physically impossible for mass gassings to have taken place as reported by eyewitnesses. Shortly after Easter of 1993, Gen. Remer had sent thousands of copies of this report to prominent politicians, jurists, historians, chemists, and various media in Germany. As a result of this, every lobbyist and pressure group imaginable demanded that my activities as expert witness be suppressed by every means available. In that memorable springtime I received a number of telephone calls from various news media at my

worksite, which displeased the business office of the Institute. The identities of the various callers and contents of conversations are of no interest here, with one exception: when the gentleman on the other end identified himself as Jean-Claude Pressac. He asked for my private telephone number, which I politely declined to give him. I suggest that he communicate with me in writing. To this he replied that, for reasons of security, he preferred to not communicate with me in writing, because it would be dangerous for him to do so. Then he warned me that I too should be on guard. Concerning the “Holocaust” in particular, he advised me to avoid challenging every aspect of it at one time. He said that in dealing with “Holocaust” the only hope for success without risking personal danger was to attack it piecemeal, one aspect at a time.

Since that telephone conversation, I have been convinced that Jean-Claude Pressac believed that we revisionists are correct in principle. In view of the overwhelming might of the exterminationists, however, he arrived early at the conclusion that the “system” had to be fought from within. His apparent defection to the ranks of “the enemy” and service to the cause of exterminationism was his version of salami tactics. His plan was to use the “system” in order to extract one concession after another.

If we consider his publications in chronological order, it is obvious that with each publication, Pressac came closer to one or another aspect of revisionism. His first step was simply to make public discussion of the subject possible; his second, to make the “system” acknowledge the priority of scientific evidence over eyewitness testimony; his third, to force it to acknowledge the contradictions inherent in such testimony. With every new publication he also reduced the number of victims, while his evaluation of eyewitness testimony grew more critical. Finally, after attacking the very foundations of the “Auschwitz myth,” he turned upon the other so-called “extermination camps.”[\[71\]](#)

After the publication of his second book in 1993, he must have gradually grown frightened, since this book and any subsequent statements by him made in public him many enemies. His telephone conversation with me was not the only place where he revealed his fears. Carlo Mattogno reports that he broke off all contacts with him at that time.[\[72\]](#) Prof. Faurisson reports that he suffered a near collapse while he was interrogated as a witness during Faurisson’s trial in 1995, begging the judge to excuse him from answering Faurisson’s questions:[\[73\]](#)

“You must understand that I have only one life. You must understand that I am alone in my battle.”

He refused to testify because he clearly saw that he was completely isolated and his life was in danger. The only explanation for this is the fact that a candid statement before the French court would have had severe consequences since it would have been revisionist in nature.

On July 23, 2003, Jean-Claude Pressac died at the young age of merely 59 years. With his publications he made a vast documentation, which museums and archives had been hiding until then, accessible to independent Holocaust researchers. He also pointed out where to find an even richer documentary treasure. His works also led to the establishment's acknowledgment that the revisionist method of technical and scientific documentary criticism is the only proper historiographic method. By so doing, Pressac catalyzed the progress of revisionist research to a degree as is only met by Fred Leuchter's work.

And so, even though his writings are scientifically questionable, Pressac was without doubt the most politically successful revisionist to date. He was in fact our double agent.

We should be grateful for this.

Fantasies of a Biochemist

By Germar Rudolf

George Wellers has been both Professor for Physiology and Biochemistry at France's National Center for Scientific Research (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, CNRS) and president of the historical commission of the Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation (Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine, CDJC) in Paris. Wellers authored several contributions on the Holocaust,[\[74\]](#) which is why he was considered one of the most prominent French representatives of the official Holocaust thesis.

When Holocaust revisionism caused international attention for the first time at the end of the 1970s and at the early 1980s, those sitting in the offices of officially ordained Holocausters saw themselves compelled "to once and for all irrefutably write down in stone the entire historical truth." The *crème de la crème* of the exterminationists – including Georges Wellers[\[75\]](#) – therefore published a book in 1983, in which they laid down their best arguments meant to silence the revisionists for all eternity.[\[76\]](#)

I wonder, though, if these noble ladies and gentlemen have noticed that their absolutistic claim of irrefutably knowing the truth and wanting to write it in stone for all eternity, which I quoted above and which was taken from the prologue of this very book (p. 2), is nothing but a declaration of scientific bankruptcy *par excellence*?

George Wellers' contributions to this book consist of chapter VII on Auschwitz as well as a brief discussion of both poison gases, which were allegedly used to commit the claimed mass gassings in Nation Socialist camps.[\[77\]](#) His brief contribution on the poison gases is the only one that comes at least somewhat close to a forensic approach of investigating the crimes that the book claims to have happened. But Wellers disappoints us in two ways. First he does not quote any toxicological or chemical literature, which would enable the reader to verify his claims,[\[78\]](#) and next he – as all the other contributors as well – does not address with even a single word the revisionist theses, which the book allegedly intends to refute. Two main criteria to identify unscientific works, however, are a) not to back up factual

claims with references to appropriate evidence, and b) not to even mention the thesis and its supporting evidence which the work claims to refute.

If one could at least rely on the accuracy of Wellers' statements, I would be inclined to overlook these flaws. A verification of his claims shows, however, that Wellers has failed in this regard as well.

About the first poison gas, carbon monoxide, he states (pp. 281f.):

"In the 'S-wagons' and in the first gas chambers of the extermination camps, exhaust gasses rich in carbon [mon]oxide of badly adjusted engines were used."

True to the deceptive style of the entire book, Wellers withholds the fact that – according to witness testimonies accepted today[79] – *diesel* engines were used in the Treblinka and Belzec camps, where no less than 1,500,000 Jews are claimed to have been killed. But the exhaust gas of diesel engines can under no circumstance, not even if badly adjusted, be "rich in carbon [mon]oxide." [80] It is therefore absurd to claim that anyone would have seriously tried to use diesel engines for mass murder. Because Wellers knew that, he simply hid the diesel engine from his readers. He also did not mention that the "S" in the German term "S-wagon" (*S-Wagen*) did not stand for "special," as he suggests to his readers, but that it was an abbreviation for a truck with "standard drive" (*Standardantrieb*, here rear wheel drive), which was in contrast to "all-wheel drive" (*Allradantrieb*, *A-Wagen*). [81]

No less misleading is Wellers on p. 283, where he suggests that the product Zyklon B released its poisonous gas very quickly, because the boiling point of liquid hydrogen cyanide is as low as 25.7°C (78.3°F):

"This temperature [of human skin=34°C; 93°F] means for hydrogen cyanide the same as 132°C [270°F] for water. In other words: the surface of human skin is for hydrogen cyanide similarly warm as a surface heated to 132°C for water!"

The problem is, however, that during the alleged gassing hydrogen cyanide was not poured in liquid form onto the skin of the victims, but that it was absorbed in porous granules of gypsum. [82] The evaporation from this carrier material lasts more than an hour even at room temperature. [83]

It gets really embarrassing when Wellers makes biochemical statements. He claims, for instance, that the attachment of hydrogen cyanide to the breathing enzyme cytochrom oxydase is irreversible (p. 285). "It suffices to take a chemical handbook in the hand," writes Wellers on p. 286. If only he had done it for his own area of expertise, then he might have remembered

that cyanide poisonings are reversible.[84]

Moreover, his advice to look into a chemical handbook had not the desired effect on Wellers, because he tries to explain, how to understand the confession of Josef Kramer. Kramer, former commander of the Natzweiler camp in Alsace and at war's end of the Bergen-Belsen camp, had been captured and interrogated by the British. Kramer confessed under torture[85] – which Wellers does not mention either – that inmates were gassed in the Natzweiler camp with hydrogen cyanide gas generated from a cyanide salt by pouring water over it. Chemically seen this is utter nonsense, because water is not capable of releasing large amounts of gaseous hydrogen cyanide from cyanide salts. Hydrogen cyanide is extremely soluble in water, so that it is hard to release it as a gas once dissolved in water.

In an attempt to salvage the credibility of this witness' confession, which is worthless already because of the torture, Wellers opened a chemical handbook and claims that he discovered in it the possibility to generate hydrogen cyanide **gas** by pouring water over a mixture of a cyanide salt (like potassium cyanide, KCN, or calcium cyanide, $\text{Ca}(\text{CN})_2$) with a crystalline acid (like citric acid) (pp. 286f.). What Wellers did not read in his chemical handbook, however, is the fact mentioned above that hydrogen cyanide developed in this way is not gaseous but remains almost completely dissolved in the water.[86] To gas someone within a few minutes with such a mixture, as Kramer claimed, gigantic amounts of that mixture would have had to be used, more likely resulting in the victims drowning in, and being poisoned by, this water/salt mixture rather than dying of gas poisoning.

On thesis appearing already in this 1983 text of Wellers became one of the main pillars, upon which he rested his critique[87] of the *Leuchter Report*, [88] which is why I quote this passage in more detail. Considering the fact that hydrogen cyanide poisonings occur rather quickly (at least faster than carbon monoxide poisonings also discussed by Wellers), he states (pp. 285f.):

“Finally it is clear that in both cases [hydrogen cyanide & carbon monoxide] humans keep the poison inside of their body with each breath, so that the concentration of the poison in the surrounding air decreases. This reduction seems unimportant, particularly in case of Zyklon B, because in average a mere 70 mg of hydrogen cyanide suffice to kill a grown up man, a little less to kill a woman, and even less to kill a child. If assuming that in average 50 mg of pure hydrogen cyanide per person is required, that is 50,000 mg or 50 g of pure hydrogen cyanide for 1,000

people, which disappear out of the surrounding air, then this explains that the possibility of a quick ventilation [of the gas chamber] evolves.”

I will now investigate if that is really as clear as Wellers claims.

In 1988, the already mentioned *Leuchter Report* of American expert for execution technologies Fred Leuchter was published. For this report, Leuchter had taken wall samples from rooms in Auschwitz, which are claimed to have been used as homicidal gas chambers. An analysis of these samples indicated that no significant amounts of cyanide residues can be found in them. Hence, Wellers wrote in his 1989 critique of the Leuchter Report:[\[89\]](#)

“It is thus true what I ‘predicted’ since 1981,^[90] namely that after the death of the victims no hydrogen cyanide vapors could have been left behind in the atmosphere of the gas chambers as they had been used in Auschwitz, or at most ‘infinitesimal traces.’”

“It is obvious that any poison that is administered in lethal doses in which way ever, remains in the corpse of the victims; after all, it would not be lethal if it were not present. With poison gases, which spread in lethal doses together with the circulating air inhaled inside of a hermetically sealed room, it is as follows: they penetrate into the human body with each breath and get chemically fixed in a way that the exhaled air contains nothing of those gases. Result: With each – unavoidable – inhalation the body of the victim gets enriched with poison, whereas its concentration gets reduced accordingly in the circulating air.” (pp. 232f.)

“Be that as it may, Leuchter has shown that the evacuation of corpses right after the gassing is not impossible at all and that Faurisson’s speculations are nothing but delusions of a mythomaniac.” (p. 234)

Before discussing Wellers’ thesis, I have to make a logical objection to the way he argues. Wellers argues that the lack of chemical residues of the poisonous gas in the claimed homicidal gas chambers does not prove that no poison gas was used there, but only that the gassings did not result in the formation of any residues. If, on the other hand, one could find large amounts of cyanide residues in the alleged homicidal gas chambers, then Wellers’ thesis of the human lung as a perfect air filter would be refuted, yet the existence of homicidal gas chambers would be established anyway. In other words: For Wellers’ underlying theory – the existence of homicidal gas chambers – it does not matter at all what the facts are, because his theory will be confirmed under any circumstances. Theories, however, which cannot be

affected by any facts, are by definition unscientific. The only proper statement would be, if Wellers would have concluded regarding Leuchter's analytical results that they can serve neither to prove nor to disprove the existence of gas chambers – provided, of course, that his thesis about lungs as perfect air filters is correct.

Let me now turn to factual matters. Wellers' thesis claims that victims of poisonings with gases (gassing) unavoidably reduce the poison content of the room they are locked into until finally all the poison is within the victims' bodies. This is why, according to Wellers, we could not possibly expect to find any residues of the poison in the walls of the homicidal gas chambers. There is, of course, no reason to restrict Wellers' thesis to human victims, because lice, for instance, also incorporate the poison into their bodies by breathing without releasing the poison as such back into the environment. Hence, we also should not expect to find any cyanide residues in the walls of the delousing chambers. The fact is, however, that both Leuchter and I have found gigantic amounts of such residues in samples taken from the walls of these delousing chambers.[\[91\]](#) This shows that Wellers' thesis cannot be correct already for logical reasons.

Now to the reasons why Wellers is on the wrong track with his argument. His thesis has two prerequisites:

- a. Only exactly as much poison was released into the air as was needed to kill the victims locked into the chamber.
- b. The poison released only affected the victims, but did not react at all with the walls.

Point b. is not without humor, because it requires that each hydrogen cyanide molecule must have a conscience and a free will in order to intentionally stay away from the walls and fly exclusively to the victims in order to be inhaled by them.

Point a. is at least theoretically possible, but not practically. No potential murderer merely uses exactly the minimum amount of poison to kill his victim, because that would render the "success" of such a murder uncertain and would also drag it out for quite a long time. Most poison murders are therefore committed with a large overdose to ensure a fast and reliable "success."

Wellers' thesis has therefore little to do with reality and even less with the historical "evidence," which he and his colleagues are so fond of quoting, that is, the events during the supposed gassings in the alleged gas chambers

as claimed by self-declared witnesses. In my own expert report I have thoroughly addressed that issue and backed it up with plenty of evidence.[\[92\]](#) I will now summarize the results.

First of all, Wellers' thesis contradicts claims by witnesses about the amount of poison used. According to that, amounts exceeding the minimally necessary by the factor of 35 to 170 were used.[\[93\]](#)

Furthermore, Wellers' thesis of a minimal amount of poison used also contradicts the execution times claimed by witnesses, which range between instantaneously to a few minutes.[\[94\]](#) What Wellers did not take into consideration is that, although hydrogen cyanide kills quickly, it does not kill instantaneously as for example nerve gases. The only proven data for execution times with hydrogen cyanide derive from gas chamber executions in the U.S., where doses ten times higher than the lethal concentration are used. And although the victim is exposed to this concentration almost immediately, his agony still lasts between ten to fifteen minutes or more.[\[95\]](#)

As Italian revisionist historian Carlo Mattogno pointed out,[\[96\]](#) German Chemist Prof. Dr. Fritz Haber even determined an approximate relationship between the time until death occurs from poisoning and the overdose required for this. According to this "Haber equation," one has to tenfold the dose if one wants to kill within a tenth of the time. So if we wanted to kill ten times faster than the execution times in U.S. gas chambers, thus reducing 10-15 minutes to one and a half minute, this then would require ten times more poison.

It thus turns out that the successful murder of thousands of people in a few moments or minutes would require an even higher overdose than what was applied in U.S. gas chambers (at least twice as much, therefore at least an overdose of 20 to 30 times and more). The estimated breathing volume of the victims also lets us assess the approximate concentration of the poison in the air required to let the victims inhale sufficient poison within a moment, so that they die within a few minutes. This concentration also is approximately ten times as high as would be needed to kill slowly in the long run.

Because Zyklon B releases only some 5 to 10% of its poison within the first 5 to 10 minutes of its exposure to air,¹⁰ this means that ten times as much Zyklon B had to be applied than otherwise necessary in order to obtain such a high overdose within 5 to 10 minutes. It would also have been necessary to dissipate this poison quickly throughout the entire chamber in order to swiftly reach and poison even those victims standing farthest away from the source.

But since there was no such dissipating device in the alleged gas chambers of Auschwitz, this deficiency would have to have been compensated by adding even considerably more Zyklon B. One therefore had to introduce Zyklon B amounts into the alleged gas chambers, which would have exceeded the amount Wellers assumes by the factor 200, if not 400. This shows that the quantities of Zyklon B allegedly used according to witness testimony is really only the lower level of what would have been required.

Now to the last question: Could the victims' lungs have cleaned the air almost completely from the poison gas? That can be refuted as well, because the prerequisite for the scenarios claimed by witnesses is that such high overdoses were contained in the air that the victims died quickly. If the victims could have cleaned the air from the poison, those standing close to the source would have acted as filters and would have shielded those standing far away. The fact is, however, that the claimed fast murder could succeed only if high concentrations of the poison gas were present everywhere in the gas chamber at every time. Losses of poison by inhalation would have to be compensated by additional poison, because the high overdoses in the air had to be maintained. This apart from the fact that the initially rapidly increasing concentration of the poison gas does not come to a standstill once the last victim has succumbed to it. After all, by then the Zyklon B has released only some 5-10% of its poison. It will continue to release its poison after that, so that the poison concentration will keep rising, and even fast so, once the breathing of the victims slowed down or came to a standstill.

An almost complete incorporation of all hydrogen cyanide by the victims requires that at least some of the victims stay alive throughout the entire period during which Zyklon B releases its poison (2 hours). This would mean that only such a tiny amount of poison was to be administered that there is just enough to kill those standing for some two hours at the walls, which were farthest away from the poison source. But those victims would have suffocated much earlier due to lack of oxygen, because after all, the gas chambers are claimed to have been sealed hermetically and packed full with people. Under such conditions, death through suffocation would have occurred within some 45 to 60 minutes even without any poison gas.[\[97\]](#) Wellers' scenario does therefore not only contradict all witness testimonies, it does also not make any sense. Why should the SS have wasted its precious Zyklon B, if the people would have suffocated in those chambers anyway?

Back to what the witnesses claim, namely swift gassings with large

overdoses of poison. If that was the case, I need to ask Dr. George Wellers, how he wants to immediately open and evacuate a room after an immediate and successful gassing of all victims, if such a gassing required a poison gas concentration many hundred times higher than the minimal lethal concentration?

It would also be nice to find out, with what kind of apparatus Dr. Wellers wants to prevent the myriads of hydrogen cyanide molecules to accumulate in the cool and wet walls of the morgues. After all, hydrogen cyanide loves cool and moist walls much more than the warm human skin.

The few chemical questions Dr. Wellers addressed in his article once more raise the question of his competence. He states, for instance, that Leuchter is right when claiming that it was necessary to heat a room beyond the boiling temperature of hydrogen cyanide in order to transform it into its gaseous aggregate state (p. 234). This is of course nonsense. After all, water does not wait to evaporate until temperatures have exceeded 100°C either.

The article discussed here is characterized by a total lack of calculations or references to technical or scientific literature, just like Wellers' initially mentioned contribution in the collective work by E. Kogon et al. The only exception is a reference to a pamphlet of the Merck Company on the toxicity of hydrogen cyanide. Other than that he merely quotes his own works, where one cannot find any references to non-anecdotal, scientific literature either.

It thus turns out: what Wellers claimed to be clear back in 1983, is nothing but the wishful thinking of a professor for biochemistry who does not exactly distinguish himself with competence.

Polish Pseudo-Scientists

By Germar Rudolf

1. Prelude

Excitement filled the rooms of the Polish State Museum of Auschwitz in spring 1988, when news came to Poland that the U.S. American expert for execution technologies Fred Leuchter believed to have demonstrated, among other things with the help of chemical analyses, that the alleged gas chambers in Auschwitz could not have been used, and demonstrably had not been used, for mass murder.[\[98\]](#) Because things they did not want to accept could not possibly be true – after all, this would be the end of the profitable museum business – the museum’s directorate ventured out to refute this American expert report. They ordered Prof. Jan Markiewicz, an expert for technical testing from the Jan Sehn Institute in Krakow, to take wall samples from various buildings or building ruins in the Auschwitz und Birkenau camps and to test them for chemical residues (cyanide compounds). These cyanide compounds are remnants of hydrogen cyanide, the active ingredient in the delousing product Zyklon B, with which lice had been killed in delousing chambers at Auschwitz, and supposedly humans in the alleged homicidal gas chambers. The results of these analyses by Prof. Markiewicz and his colleagues are given in Table 1 (next page).

Samples no. 1, 2, and 7-11 were taken from a delousing chamber, in which the clothes of inmates were deloused with hydrogen cyanide during the war. It is not claimed by anyone that humans were killed in this room. The only “positive” result of a sample taken from a room that according to the Museum had been a homicidal gas chamber is no. 15. All other samples did not contain any detectable residues.

These results seem to suggest that samples from the alleged homicidal gas chambers contain considerable less cyanide residue than samples from delousing chambers or even none at all. There are two things with the values given by Markiewicz, however, that struck me as odd:

1. The Polish original of this table gives cyanide as mg of potassium cyanide per 100 g of sample material instead of the internationally standard of mg of cyanide per kg sample material.

2. The Krakow analytic results of samples taken from the delousing chamber are a factor 10,000(!) lower than results of samples taken from there by Fred Leuchter and by me. Apart from this, all values are below the detection level of the method of analysis used by all professional analytic laboratories in the world (app. 1 mg/kg). I therefore assumed already in 1993 that the Poles committed a methodical error.[\[99\]](#)

Table 1: Cyanide concentrations in wall samples of homicidal gas chambers / delousing chambers				
According to Institute for Forensic Reserach, department for toxicology, Krakow, Poland; data given in mg per kg				
No.	Building	Sample taking location and - depth	Material	CN ⁻
1	Disinfestation Block 3	Room 4, around the ventilator opening, 2 mm	Plaster	0.068
2	Disinfestation Block 3	Room 4, next to doors to Room 3, 2 mm	Plaster	0.036
7	Disinfestation Block 3	Room 3, below window, opposite, 2 mm	Plaster	0.076
8	Disinfestation Block 3	Door opening between Room 2 and 1, 2 mm upper left	Plaster	0.140
9	Disinfestation Block 3	Like Nr. 8, lower left	Plaster	0.404
10	Disinfestation Block 3	Room 1, Ventilator opening, 2 mm	Plaster	0.528
11	Disinfestation Block 3	Like 10, light blue	Plaster	0.588
15	Crematorium II, morgue 1	Concrete support columns	Plaster (?)	0.024
4 additional samples from crematorium II, 1 from crematorium I, 1 from crematorium V, in each case an alleged gas chamber, and 2 control samples contained demonstrable traces of CN ⁻ .				

Despite their questionable background, these analytic results seemed to support the revisionists. It was therefore apparently decided by the Auschwitz Museum not to publish them. However, someone sympathetic to revisionism within the Auschwitz museum sent photocopies of these analytic results to some known revisionist in spring of 1991, who saw to it that this study was published immediately.[\[100\]](#) Already the comments added to these results by Prof. Markiewicz indicate that he is utterly incompetent to address the chemical issues involved:[\[101\]](#)

“Hydrogen cyanide is a weak acid, which has the result that its salts decompose slightly in the presence of stronger acids. One of these

stronger acids is carbonic acid, which arises from the reaction between carbon dioxide and water. [Even] stronger acids, such as, for example, sulfuric acid, decompose cyanide even more easily. Complex compounds of cyanide ions with heavy metals are more durable. Among such compounds is the already mentioned 'Prussian Blue' [=Iron Blue], but even this decomposes slowly in an acid environment.

One could hardly expect, therefore, that building materials (plaster, brick) exposed to environmental influences (precipitation, acid oxides, especially sulfuric and nitric monoxide) would contain derivative compounds of cyanides after a period of 45 years."

This contradicts the facts as established in my expert report with the help of a vast amount of expert literature:[\[102\]](#)

a) Carbon dioxide is only slightly soluble in water and hardly forms carbonic acid in water at all. It therefore can hardly "decompose" the cyanide salts.[\[103\]](#)

b) Iron Blue (Prussian Blue) is extraordinarily stable in acids and is not destroyed by the influences of weathering, even over decades.[\[104\]](#)

In September 1991 I met a certain Werner Wegner at a seminar on revisionism held by a liberal party in Nuremberg, Germany. Wegner had decided to refute the revisionists.[\[105\]](#) After this meeting, a brief correspondence developed between Mr. Wegner and me, during which he also sent me photocopies of letters he had received from Prof. Markiewicz. Apparently, Mr. Wegner had brought the chemical statements I had made in a letter to him to the attention of Prof. Markiewicz with the request to address them, which he must have done promptly. In this private correspondence with Werner Wegner, Prof. Markiewicz once again revealed his ignorance on the issues involved:[\[106\]](#)

"VIII. Water activates many chemical processes. The chambers were certainly moist. What kind of influence this exerts upon the binding of HCN by cement (wall plaster) – is unknown to us. [...]

IX. The blue stains on the exterior walls of Building 5a are not easily explained. Above all, we must examine whether or not it actual is Berlin Blue [=Iron Blue...]"

I had started only in spring of 1991 to investigate the conditions beneficial to the formation of Iron Blue. It was not before summer of 1991 that I came to understand that moist walls, coupled with a minimum of alkalinity, were the main factors in the formation of Iron Blue in walls exposed to hydrogen

cyanide (HCN) gas. I came to that insight only because an engineer assisted me by lending me several books on the chemistry of cement and concrete. It is therefore no disgrace if one does not know certain things. But as a scientist one should strive to remedy this lack of knowledge, because that is the essence of science.

In a letter to the *Institute for Historical Review*, Markiewicz explained that his Institute considered the research results listed above not to be an end result, but that further investigations would follow.[\[107\]](#) It had thus to be expected that this preliminary study would be followed by a more comprehensive one, which would address the questions that Markiewicz himself had admitted to require an answer.

But what actually followed was the exact opposite.

2. Critique

2.1. Summary

The announced, more comprehensive study about the question of detectability of cyanide compounds in delousing chambers and alleged homicidal gas chambers of the Auschwitz camp was finally published in 1994.[\[108\]](#)

As a reminder: The analytical results of wall samples taken by Fred Leuchter¹ and by me^{2,5} from the alleged homicidal gas chambers indicated no significant residues of the active ingredient of Zyklon B (cyanides), whereas samples taken from delousing chambers had gigantic amounts of such residues. Leuchter concluded from this that there could not have been any gassing at all in these rooms, whereas I concluded that gassing could at least not have taken place to the extent and in the manner reported by witnesses.[\[109\]](#)

The Polish authors discussed here, on the other hand, found that the supposed homicidal gas chambers contain quantities of cyanide comparable to the delousing chambers, from which they conclude that the mass gassings at Auschwitz took place.

The three Polish authors used an analytical method that is unable to detect the most important long-term stable cyanide compounds of the type of Iron Blue. They did this to prevent the detection of residues, which got into the walls by other means, for instance by a blue wall paint.

The three Polish authors also admitted not to have understood the

chemical process involved when hydrogen cyanide is absorbed in building material. They ignored facts established by me, which explain these chemical processes, even though they knew about these facts, because they quoted my respective work.[\[110\]](#) Apart from this, a case of construction damage caused by hydrogen cyanide proves that blue discolorations of walls by Iron Blue can indeed be the result of exposing a wall to hydrogen cyanide.[\[111\]](#) Hence, the analytical results of the three Polish authors have to be rejected as misleading due to their intentional use of a wrong analytical method. The suspicion arises that their contribution was motivated by deceptive intentions.

2.2. Method of Analysis

Markiewicz and his colleagues exposed finely pulverized samples to 10% sulfuric acid in a microdiffusion chamber for 24 hours. Hydrogen cyanide diffusing out of the sample was captured in a lye solution. The analysis of cyanide was done by converting it to a dye that could be detected spectrometrically. For this purpose they resorted to a highly sensitive method published in 1947.[\[112\]](#)

The analysis institutes[\[113\]](#) hired by F. Leuchter and me to investigate our samples used a method that was based on the standard method for the analysis of total cyanide in liquid samples as developed by the Society of German Chemists (DIN 38 405, Part D 13). In this method finely pulverized samples are heated for 1 to 2 hours in a slightly reductive, hydrochloric acid solution. The gaseous HCN produced is fed through an alkaline solution by a stream of air. For small quantities the analysis was done by the above-mentioned spectrometric method, for larger quantities a titration method was used.

Markiewicz and his colleagues confirm that iron cyanide compounds cannot be detected with their procedure. This statement is in agreement with the technical literature cited in my expert report on the almost complete indestructibility of this very stable family of compounds even with the use of cold, concentrated acid. The Polish authors state that the reason for their choice of method was that they could not imagine how blue iron cyanide compounds could form in masonry and that they agree with Josef Bailer[\[114\]](#) that the blue discoloration of the delousing chamber walls could be a coat of paint. In order to exclude such paint from the analysis they decided to employ a method that was not sensitive to iron cyanide.

In the case of the bluely stained delousing chambers, such a procedure

would be correct only when one could exclude with reasonable certainty that the effect of hydrogen cyanide on masonry can lead to the formation of iron cyanide and if there is indeed any evidence of the use of a blue wall paint containing cyanide compounds. However, the Polish authors have failed completely to clarify these questions. Not only that, but they ignored altogether the arguments given in my expert report^{2,5} and in a book of mine,¹³ supported by a long list of relevant technical literature, for the fact that the formation of stable iron cyanide is quite likely under certain circumstances. They likewise ignored the arguments that refute the hypothesis of blue paint in the Auschwitz delousing chambers.

I have dealt with this absurd hypothesis of Bailer in detail both in my expert as well as in my above-mentioned book. I have asked Dr. Bailer how it is that this supposed “coat of paint” only appears as random, irregular patches and can also be found deep within the wall, but I have not received an answer so far. In addition, one can find high levels of cyanide in plaster and in inner layers of mortar even in places that appear completely white. Herr Bailer has never explained to me whether he knows about some “white cyanide” color with which walls, plaster, and mortar can be dyed white before they are applied. He also has to this day refused to name a blue wall color that contains the pigment Iron Blue, because such paint does not and did never exist.[\[115\]](#)

The Polish authors could have checked their unfounded hypothesis of the impossibility of formation of stable iron cyanide compounds against their own gassing experiments. If they had examined only one of these samples for total cyanide content with the internationally recognized DIN method, then they probably would have seen their error. It is especially strange that the samples from locations that show no blue discoloration (supposed gas chambers, prisoners’ barracks, and test gassings) were analyzed with the method insensitive to iron cyanide as well. In these cases one would expect no interference from blue paint and one could have easily determined whether iron cyanide forms in masonry or not and whether the analytic results of the two different methods are comparable.

That the development of bluish patches on the surfaces of walls similar in appearance to those on the walls of the Auschwitz delousing chambers is the consequence of HCN gassing can be shown dramatically by one reference in the technical literature. In 1981, the periodically published journal *Bauschäden Sammlung* (Collection of Construction Damages) reported about the

effects of a hydrogen cyanide gassing on a church that had been freshly plastered a few weeks before.¹⁴ In that case deep blue patches appeared all over after several months. The reaction did not stop for over a year. The new plaster had to be completely knocked down, since the iron cyanide complex could not be removed any other way.

Therefore it is established with certainty that the analytic method chosen by the Polish authors excluded from the analysis exactly those compounds, which this dispute is all about.

2.3. Limits of Detectability and Results of Analysis

The Polish authors state that the limit of detectability for their analytic method is 3-4 µg cyanide per kg of sample material. In the DIN method this limit is near 2.5 µg, and in 1947 J. Epstein stated that the limit should be less than 1 µg.¹⁵ It should be noted, however, that the last two limits only apply to solutions of cyanide compounds in water. Experience with the analysis of chemical compounds in highly heterogeneous, not completely soluble solids, such as masonry, shows that such analyses are an order of magnitude more difficult. Accordingly, professional analytical institutes give as limits of detectability for solid samples not 2.5 µg/kg, but at least 100 µg/kg and sometimes even 1,000 µg/kg (1,000 µg = 1 mg). Sometimes even these values can be troublesome, because masonry samples usually contain large quantities of carbonate, which can disturb the detection of cyanide (cf. the DIN method).

It is doubtful that the experiences of Markiewicz and his colleagues to determine their limit of detectability is based on use of solid materials, because in this case it would be necessary to fill these solid samples with a defined amount of cyanide, and then to try to find them again with an analysis. And if their limit of detectability is based on experiments with liquid solutions, all analytic results with values lower than 1 mg/kg should be looked at skeptically.

Tab. 2: Comparison of Orders of Magnitude of Analytical Results of Various Samples in mg CN ⁻ /kg			
AUTHOR	MARKIEWICZ ET AL.	LEUCHTER	RUDOLF
Analysis of:	Cyanide without Iron Cyanides	Total Cyanide	Total Cyanide
Delousing	0 – 0.8	1,025	1,000 – 13,000

Chambers			
Alleged Gas Chambers	0 – 0.6	0 – 8	0 – 7 *
Inmate Huts	0	–	0 – 3 *
Experimental Gassings	0 – 12	–	50 – 100
* not reproducible, therefore not interpretable, i.e.: insignificant, considered to be zero.			

Table 2 gives the orders of magnitude of analytic results of the three works discussed here in mg/kg (ppm). The conditions of my test gassings were similar to those of Markiewicz and party. However, the analyses of my samples were made only after a relatively long period after the gassing (about 2 months) whereas the maximum values of Markiewicz and party come from analyses made 48 hours after the samples' exposure to the gas. (For more details on the test gassings see below.)

Under the assumption that these results are accurate at least in their order of magnitude, several interesting conclusions can be made from a comparison of the results of the different analytic methods:

1. 99.9% of the cyanide presently detectable in the walls of the delousing chambers of Auschwitz is bound in a way that is not detectable by the method of Markiewicz and party. Therefore these are probably complex iron cyanides such as Iron Blue. More precisely, the ratio of stable iron cyanide compounds to less stable cyanide compounds is 1,000 to 10,000 and more to 1.
2. The corresponding ratio in the samples from the supposed homicidal gas chambers is at most 10 to 1.
3. While Markiewicz and party found that the level of unstable cyanide compounds in the alleged homicidal gas chambers and in the delousing chambers are nearly equal, the analytic results of Leuchter and me show that the total cyanide level – and thus probably also the iron cyanide level – in the delousing chambers is a factor of 1,000 or more higher than that in the supposed gas chambers.

First, one can exclude that this effect can be caused by the dissolution of stable iron cyanide compounds in the alleged homicidal gas chambers, because it flies in the face of logic that the stable compounds dissolve while the unstable ones can be detected still today at unreduced levels. If one does not want to attribute this phenomenon to a false analytical method or to an incorrect interpretation of the extremely low

analytic results of the Polish authors, one cannot avoid the conclusion that iron cyanide compounds were unable to form only in the supposed homicidal gas chambers. Looking at the formation conditions of Iron Blue in the above-quoted case of construction damage to a gassed church, one is reminded of the environmental conditions that were present in the alleged homicidal gas chambers of crematoria II and III in Auschwitz-Birkenau. In both cases the walls were cool and moist, and their alkaline cement-plaster had been applied just a few weeks before the – in the case of the gas chambers: presumed – gassing. I can think of no reason why the absorbed HCN should turn into Iron Blue only in the case of the church.

4. Markiewicz and party found nearly a 50% reduction of cyanide levels in their test-gassed samples after a month's storage. Their analytic results are approximately 100 times less than in my tests, which were stored for over two months in a warm, dry room. Here also the Polish authors seem to have found merely 1% of the total cyanide, which indicates that even in such a short time the vast majority of cyanides is bound as stable iron cyanides. In the report on the construction damage case cited above it was mentioned that the reaction of the absorbed cyanide producing Iron Blue was complete only after 1½ years. The preliminary phase of this reaction, the formation of much paler iron cyanides (prussiates of sodium, calcium, potassium), could therefore have taken place much earlier.

2.4. Analytic Results from Test Samples

Apart from these problematic analytic results the test gassings performed by the three Polish authors reveal more interesting details that call for more questions. Table 3 lists the results of analysis of HCN test gassings that were carried out by the Polish authors under different conditions. The first row shows the data for the absorption of HCN alone, while the second row shows the data with the influence of high concentrations of carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the air on the absorption of HCN.

The results of the HCN gassing support my finding that moist walls absorb considerably more HCN than dry walls (ten times as much and more). Because the delousing chambers were heated rooms with dry walls while the alleged homicidal gas chambers of crematoria II and III were unheated cellars (morgues) with moist walls, I concluded that the reactivity of the supposed gas chambers with respect to the formation of stable iron cyanide compounds

must have been much greater than that of the dry delousing chambers.

The second row is more interesting. Here air containing 2 vol.-% HCN was enriched with 10 vol.-% CO₂. The Polish authors argue that the breathing of the victims in the alleged homicidal gas chamber would have raised the CO₂-content in the air. This needed to be considered. Since according to witness statements the victims died within approximately 5 minutes, they could have raised the CO₂-content in this time up to 1 vol.-%. This was ten times greater than the concentration of HCN allegedly used, so the Poles claim. In their test, however, the Poles only applied a factor of 5.

Table 3: Analytic results of HCN-gassed Samples from Markiewicz and others data in mg CN ⁻ /kg										
Material:	Fresh Plaster		Old Mortar		Fresh Mortar		New Brick		Old Brick	
Exposed to:	dry	moist	dry	moist	dry	moist	dry	moist	dry	moist
2 % HCN	0.024	0.48	–	–	0.176	2.7	0.004	0.052	0.02	0
+ 10 % CO ₂	5.92	12.8	1	0.244	0.492	0.388	0.052	0.036	0.024	0.060

These data of the three Polish authors need some critical remarks. First, it is not likely that it would be possible to kill quickly in a large room stuffed with people and with a relatively low concentration of HCN. I have made detailed studies of this in my expert report. It is also questionable to raise the concentration of CO₂ in a room, which supposedly had a CO₂-content of 1 vol.-%, to a concentration of 10 vol.-% for the experiments. The behavior of moist, fresh, plaster and mortar that had not yet set can be strongly influenced by this 10-fold difference, and the absorption of HCN can be greatly affected.

Looking at the influence of CO₂ on the HCN absorption of various building materials, we see: With fresh, dry plaster the absorption is massively increased (247 times), with fresh, moist plaster the increase is less intense (27 times), with fresh, dry mortar the absorption is hardly increased (barely 3 times), whereas with fresh, moist mortar it is decreased (down to a seventh). Dry brick absorbs somewhat more HCN in the presence of CO₂, whereas moist brick absorbs now more, now less. From these results Markiewicz and party conclude that the cool, moist underground morgues of crematoria II and III that are claimed to have been used as homicidal gas chambers had a reactivity to form Iron Blue not higher than that of the dry delousing

chambers.

The results of the combined HCN- and CO₂-gassings are anything but uniform, but in most cases HCN absorption is *increased* with increased CO₂-content. Unfortunately the Polish authors fail to attempt an explanation of their results, and thus they do not answer the question why increased CO₂ has the respective effect in any particular case.

For example, the effect of CO₂ could be due to the fact that it lowers the pH-value of the masonry (that is, increases the acidity) and makes the material less porous by enhancing the setting process (carbonatization) of the material. Both effects would be favored by a moist material and would lead to a decrease in absorption of HCN. This does, however, not explain why in most cases the HCN absorption was increased by adding CO₂.

As a matter of fact, it cannot be determined from the article by the three Polish authors what exact material their samples were composed of or what condition they were in when they were gassed. For reactivity with respect to the absorption of HCN, however, the relative proportions of water, sand, cement, and lime used to prepare the individual samples of building material is decisive, as is the amount of time and the conditions they were exposed to (temperature, humidity) before they were gassed. For example, there could be a good factor ten difference in the absorption of HCN depending on whether one gasses a sample of lime plaster on the same day it was mixed or if one waits a week until the plaster is almost completely set. The terms “fresh” and “old” used by the Polish authors are completely insufficient in this respect.

2.5. On the Interpretation of the Results

Let us first assume that the analytic results of Markiewicz and party are correct and that they can be compared with analyses of total cyanide (which is basically impossible, as indicated), and second that by samples of plaster and mortar the Polish authors meant lime mortar and cement mortar, respectively. The former material was used to build the delousing chambers while the latter was used in the walls of the underground morgues (the alleged homicidal gas chambers) of crematoria II and III. Then the warm, dry, mostly CO₂-free delousing chambers newly put in operation would show a level of 0.024 mg cyanide per kg sample material, whereas the moist, cold, CO₂-loaded alleged gas chambers of crematoria II and III, also newly put into operation, would show a level of 0.388 mg/kg, a figure greater than that of

the delousing chambers by a factor of 16. With all other combinations of materials the factor is always greater than 1 as well (cement/cement: 2.2; cement/lime: 72; lime/lime: 533). If the Polish authors claim nevertheless that the alleged homicidal gas chambers did not have a higher reactivity to bind hydrogen cyanide than the delousing chambers, then they turn their own research results upside down!

Facing the fact that the Poles' maximum analytical values of their samples from delousing chambers are comparable to those from the underground morgue no. 1 of crematorium II – the alleged homicidal gas chamber – they force themselves to conclude that this is hardly surprising since large areas of this underground morgue are protected from environmental influence. Therefore the cyanide, once bound, would have as little reason to disappear from the morgue as from the delousing chambers. That we can agree upon. We can also agree on the implicit conclusion that the traces of cyanide remaining in the delousing chambers *would* be present in the *same* order of magnitude as in the alleged homicidal killing gas chambers, *if* the latter were used to kill hundreds of thousands of inmates with HCN. However, considering the amount of total cyanide, this is absolutely not the case. Rather there is a world of difference between the analytic values – a factor of 1,000 or more – and this in spite of the higher reactivity of the alleged homicidal gas chambers.

Another point reflects even worse on the chemical competence of the three Polish authors: They say once more that they cannot explain how the brick on the outside of the delousing chambers in Birkenau came to have patchy blue discolorations. The Polish authors have confirmed the relative inertness of bricks to the formation of detectable cyanides in their own gassing experiments, which I had determined as well. But they do not seem to have read attentively my expert report or my book, which they cite. It should be clear that the high concentrations of soluble cyanide compounds on the inner side of the walls of the delousing chambers would slowly diffuse to the outer side of the wall, driven by moisture rising from the soil through the walls and evaporating preferably at the outside. Once deposited at the outside of the walls, soluble iron cyanide compounds would be quickly converted into long-term stable Iron Blue under environmental influences. Whoever inspects the surface of the bricks of this building would realize that they have been eroded on their surface, probably mostly because of acid rain, which occurs frequently in Upper Silesia, one of the dirtiest industrial regions of the

world until the late 1980s/early 1990s. In chemical terms, iron oxides in the brick, which had been physically fixed by the sintering process during production, were physico-chemically activated by an acid medium and thus could more easily react with cyanide compounds migrating to the surface to form Iron Blue.

2.6. Conclusions

Whether or not the influence of CO₂ on the accumulation of cyanides in masonry as determined by the Polish authors in several experiments proves true or not may be important for the interpretation of the analytical results of samples taken in Auschwitz – in either direction – but with respect to the question how to assess the scientific value of the article by the three Polish authors, this is not important at all. For purely formal criteria their paper must be judged as insufficient to meet scientific standards:

1. With respect to decisive questions they do not even attempt to get involved into a factual discussion. They do mention that there have been other works on the same subject, but they ignore the arguments that were made in those works. As to the background of their work, namely the chemistry of building materials and of iron cyanide in general, they stay completely mute. On the questions raised they apparently never attempted to investigate if there have been pertinent results in expert literature. Instead they decided without any basis, other than their own authority, what is true and what is not. An example for this is the authors' declaration out of the good that they cannot explain how Iron Blue can form in building material. They therefore decide to exclude iron cyanide completely from the analysis.

2. The documentation of the experiments undertaken makes it almost impossible to reproduce the procedures. Neither the composition of the samples nor their history can be determined.

3. The conclusions of the Polish authors from their experimental data are diametrically opposed to the data themselves. As a matter of fact, even the research results of the Polish authors show that the alleged homicidal gas chambers had a higher reactivity to form stable cyanide compounds than the delousing chambers of Auschwitz. Yet the authors claim the opposite.

While missing information about the exact experimental conditions used by Markiewicz and party can perhaps be obtained, the application of a totally

incorrect analytical methods runs into insurmountable difficulties. It must therefore be demanded that the same samples should be analyzed once more with the correct method.

3. Correspondence[\[116\]](#)

The three Polish authors from the Krakow Institute for Forensic Research received this article by fax at the beginning of November 1994 with the request that they comment on the questions raised here. The answer by Prof. Markiewicz and the subsequent exchange are given in the following.

3.1. Instytut Ekspertyz Sadowych im. Prof. dra Jana Sehna

Fax to G. Rudolf on Jan. 24, 1995, 8:51 hours

To Herr Germar Rudolf

With reference to your telefaxes of 10.XI.1994 and 9.XII.1994 and the accompanying paper, “Some questions for J. Markiewicz, W. Gubala, and J. Łabędź” we would like to kindly reply as follows:

1. In our researches [we] were interested most of all in structures or ruins of structures – mostly located within the crematoria – that are said to have functioned as gas chambers. Approximately $\frac{2}{3}$ of all samples collected come from such structures. Our interest in the rooms in which the disinfections – particularly of clothing – took place by means of Zyklon B had a lesser priority, as no one doubts that this product was used there. We chose the former prisoners’ barracks as the control for this research, where – as is known – no documented use of HCN took place except for occasional general disinfection during the typhus epidemic in the camp in 1942. No cyanide compounds were found in the material from these barracks.

2. The method we used to separate HCN from its compounds excludes the possibility of decomposing of the relatively permanent “Prussian Blue” [=Iron Blue], whose origin had been claimed to be unclear in many parts of the structures under investigation. Under the experimental conditions we used for our method, the ion $[\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}(\text{CN})_6]^{4-}$ in compounds such as $\text{K}[\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}(\text{CN})_6]$ decomposed with the release of HCN. Even though we do not exclude other possibilities for the formation of Prussian Blue in

the walls of the structures investigated, using our method we found cyanide compounds other than the above-mentioned pigment. The real level of total cyanide compounds could therefore be higher than shown by our analysis. We therefore established that as a result of the reaction of HCN with the compounds of the walls of the structures investigated not only Prussian Blue develops, but also other compounds, which in many cases can persist for periods of almost 50 years. If only such conditions were present as allowed Prussian Blue alone to develop,[\[117\]](#) the walls of the delousing facilities, for example, should be completely blue.

It should be noted here that the management of the Museum in Auschwitz made available to us a small sample of diatomaceous earth from an old Zyklon B can (a museum artifact). Using our method we found 1,360 $\mu\text{g CN}^-/\text{kg}$, but there was no blue discoloration.

3. The materials that we – and Herr Rudolf – investigated are not homogeneous and thereby their chemical properties – particularly binding capacity and/or reaction capacity with respect to HCN – will be different from one fragment to the next. The variation of readings was, for example, in crematorium III 0-640 $\mu\text{g CN}^-/\text{kg}$, and in crematorium IV 0-500 $\mu\text{g CN}^-/\text{kg}$. The same phenomenon occurs in the disinfection facilities. For example, in block no. 30 in Auschwitz the figures were 0-900 $\mu\text{g CN}^-/\text{kg}$. For the bath-house in Birkenau [BW5a] the figures were 0-840 $\mu\text{g CN}^-/\text{kg}$. In the latter structure there were places in addition to those, which have dark blue discolorations, where the plaster is white and has low levels of cyanide compounds. It is purely coincidental as to whether or not one takes a sample with higher or lower levels of cyanide compounds, or even a sample free of them (cf. the research results of F. A. Leuchter's samples).

4. The limit of detectability of CN^- in the method we used, given as 3-4 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$, was verified by our experiments and is close to that determined by J. Epstein, the developer of the method. It is at once a very sensitive and a very specific method, which not even Herr Rudolf disputes.

5. In connection with and on the basis of the investigations carried out on walls of structures in the former concentration camp Auschwitz-Birkenau, we carried out several pilot experiments. They do not pretend to be full-fledged studies. The material that was available to us was definitely different from the material authentically from the camp. The individual samples also differed among themselves, even macroscopically. Unfortunately it was not possible to use the same sample repeatedly under

different analytical environments, since they were destroyed in the course of the analysis. Plaster and other “fresh” materials were a few weeks old, and the “old” materials were approximately ten years old. Disregarding the substantial simplifications of the analyses, certain behaviors were noticeable that we shall investigate later in more extensive research. These behaviors are as follows:

a) Increased binding of HCN in moist material, which is easily understood;

b) CO_2 , which must have been present in the chambers in considerable concentrations, can impede the solution or binding of HCN by compounds of the material under analysis. At least one needs to be aware of this. After all, carbonic acid is a much stronger acid than hydrogen cyanide. Carbon dioxide in the air can slowly dissolve alkali cyanides. Therefore it will not favor the formation of cyanide. The samples gassed with HCN with added CO_2 apparently lose HCN more easily under stronger ventilation.

c) Water flushes significant quantities of the adsorbed or bound HCN, at least in the first stage after the fumigation.

6. The example given by Herr Rudolf of a church whose walls suffered extensive blue discoloration due to Prussian Blue during nearly a year after fumigation with HCN proves that the chemical composition of the plaster of this church and other factors not described favored the formation of this compound. Fumigation of buildings by use of HCN is done frequently even today and it is certainly not always the case that such spotting occurs after fumigation with Prussian Blue.

7. Certain considerations of Herr Rudolf such as those on the origin of the dark-blue stains on the outer (brick) walls of the delousing facility in the Birkenau camp have the character of scientific speculation that may or may not be correct. One cannot assume them as axioms without an empirical basis. This applies also to assertions that with our method we detect only 0.01%, 0.1% or 10% of the cyanide compounds in the subject material.

8. We welcome with pleasure the renewal of an expert discussion of the problems involved by competent chemists, but we cannot avoid expressing our displeasure about several expressions by Herr Rudolf that were addressed to us and which were certainly not necessary.

9. Since we are in frequent contact with the area of the Auschwitz-

camp near Krakow, we do not intend to be satisfied with the investigations done so far, the major part of which we could recently publish.

P.S.: Thank you very much for the interesting book!

[Reference to a copy of the German edition of *Dissecting the Holocaust*]
[\[118\]](#)

3.2. Comment on the Krakow Institute's Response

G. Rudolf, Jan. 25, 1995

On point 2: Detectibility and Visibility of complex iron cyanides:

In Iron Blue (Prussian Blue, $\text{Fe}[\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}(\text{CN})_6]_3$) it is exactly the compound $[\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}(\text{CN})_6]^{4-}$, which is so extraordinarily stable. Also, Iron Blue never consists of pure $\text{Fe}[\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}(\text{CN})_6]_3$, but rather, depending upon the conditions of formation, of different proportions of Fe^{3+} - and alkali or earth-alkali ions (M) ($\text{FeM}_y[\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}(\text{CN})_6]_z$). The resistance of Iron Blue to the analytical method of the Polish scientists is therefore probably due to nothing other than the stability of $[\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}(\text{CN})_6]^{4-}$ ion. If CN^- in Iron Blue cannot be detected by the method used by the three Polish scientists, their method will also not detect it in all other compounds of the type $\text{M}_x[\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}(\text{CN})_6]_y$, such as $\text{K}_4[\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}(\text{CN})_6]$. If this is correct, then it cannot be surprising when the three Polish scientists cannot detect the biggest part of cyanides with their method, since over time cyanide compounds in masonry change into more stable components of the type $\text{FeM}_y[\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6]_z$.

The assertion is incorrect that the entire surface of the walls of the Birkenau delousing chambers should be blue, if 0.1% to 1% of the walls consisted of the pigment Iron Blue. A proportion of 0.1% to 1% blue material in white plaster (mix ratio 1:100 to 1:1000) will only cause a slight, hardly noticeable bluish hue. In view of this small proportion of blue material the question rather arises: Why are there deep blue patches at all? This can be explained as result of an accumulation process of cyanide compounds on the surface of the wall because of the migration of moisture in the walls, which brings soluble cyanide compounds along with it.

The fact that samples of diatomaceous earth do not show blue discoloration despite high levels of cyanide can be explained as a result of the

lack of iron oxides as well as a result of the fact that the accumulation process cannot take place in granules of diatomaceous earth [or gypsum] stored in cans, because there is no migration of moisture similar to that found in masonry.

On point 3: Lack of cyanide compounds in white plaster samples:

My test samples # 19a and 19b show that samples showing no blue discoloration can very well have high levels of cyanide. They came from the Birkenau delousing chamber BW 5b. Both samples were gray to brown-gray but had cyanide levels of 1,860 mg CN⁻/kg in the outer layer of plaster and 3,880 mg CN⁻/kg in a deeper layer.[\[119\]](#)

Fact is that the analytic results of the Krakow scientists are in no way reconcilable with the data from the American Alpha Analytical Laboratories, from the German Institut Fresenius, and from the German Institut für Umwelt- und Schadstoffanalysen (IUS). Since it is highly unlikely that these three renowned institutes would all use a nonsensical method to measure the same nonsense for decades, the error must lie with the analytical method of the Polish scientists, which is utterly unusual in the realm of professional analytic chemistry and which is incapable of detecting the major part of cyanide content. This can be verified by the Poles themselves taking samples from delousing chambers and having them tested by an independent institute using the DIN procedure. It would also be best, if they would not mention the source of the material in order to guarantee the independence of the analysis.

On point 5: Sample description and effect of CO₂:

There is still no description of the composition of the samples. What do they mean by “plaster,” by “mortar”?

The question, why in six to eight cases of HCN gassing in the presence of CO₂ the HCN absorption by the samples was sometimes distinctly greater than without CO₂, needs yet to be answered. The blank assertion of the Polish scientists that CO₂ can not favor the accumulation of HCN is directly contradicted by their own data.

On point 6: Blue discoloration in the plaster of a gassed church:

The practice of gassings with HCN since its inception was usually confined to the treatment of older buildings that had been in use a long time – and thus required disinfestations – and whose plaster was thus old and well-set. The difference to the case documented by G. Zimmermann, where a church developed dark blue discolorations after just one gassing, was

certainly due to the fact that in this case a fresh layer of cement plaster was added just a month before, which had therefore not completely set and was thus moist and alkaline.[\[120\]](#)

Repeated gassings with HCN over an extended period of time, such as those that occurred in the delousing chambers at Birkenau and allegedly also in the alleged homicidal gas chambers there, did not occur either before or after World War II. During the war, however, there are at least also the cases of the delousing chambers (allegedly used as homicidal gas chambers according to the official view) of Majdanek [and Stutthof], in which, under the same conditions as the Birkenau delousing chambers (and as claimed for the homicidal gas chambers) a similarly massive blue discoloration can be seen.

Other delousing facilities, especially those of the Dachau type (DEGESCH circulation device), do not show this blue staining, since in wise foresight the unnecessary loss of HCN through absorption in the walls had been prevented by coating them with an impermeable paint.

This fact remains: Cyanide compounds of the type of Iron Blue can form as a result of HCN gassings, which then stain the walls with blue patches. It is also a fact that an irregular patchy discoloration can neither be explained as a result of a coat of blue paint nor can the high level of cyanide found deep in the wall and also in places where the wall appears not to be unstained be explained with such a wall paint.

It remains furthermore a fact that in view of these considerations the use of an analytic method that cannot detect these blue compounds reeks like (self-)deception.

On point 7: Patchy blue discoloration of the delousing facility's outer walls:

The three Polish authors have contributed nothing that would either support or contradict my well-founded thesis on the way, in which blue stains formed on the outer walls of the Birkenau delousing facility BW5a and 5b. They label it without reason as "scientific speculation." It would be much better to discuss my reasoning critically and to knock at the weak points. I have never spoken of "axioms" that one must accept with respect to my interpretation. Also it should not be very difficult for the Polish scientists living in Krakow, almost around the corner from Auschwitz, to take samples from the outer walls of the delousing areas and to analyze them with respect to their total cyanide content (analyzed with the DIN standard!), which would

answer many questions all at once.

On point 8: Joy over beginning of discussion and disagreeable expressions:

The three Polish scientists write in a way as if it has been revisionists that for the last 45 years have been silent about the arguments of the other side and have reviled them and ruined them by judicial and social harassment. The shoe is on the other foot. Yes, I am very glad that finally there is a discussion on the scientific level, although it requires a learning process on dealing with our mutual sensitivities.

Unfortunately the three Polish authors do not mention, which expressions in my article displeased them. This probably relates to the suspicion of scientific deception. If the three Polish authors are prepared to subject their old samples or newly taken samples to an analysis for *total* cyanide content following the DIN procedure and to present these results, I will gladly retract this suspicion. The explanations they have offered so far for the analytic method they chose are not satisfactory.

If we are to discuss disagreeable expressions I would like to raise a point that I was ready to let pass, but due to the reproaches of the Polish researchers should now be addressed:

In their article the three Polish authors impute to the revisionists the desire to white-wash the Hitler system. I have the following comments:

- Scientists should interest themselves for the scientific arguments of other scientists and not for their possible intentions. That applies even for the relationship between established science and revisionism.
- Regardless of whatever intentions whatever revisionist may have: The suggestion of presumed intentions does not weaken one single scientific argument of revisionists and therefore has no place in a scientific publication.
- Whatever the outcome of the controversy over revisionism may be, a scientist should interest himself only for the truth and not for the effect it may have on the political or moral assessment of Adolf Hitler or anybody else.
- Whoever imputes a political intention in the research of his scientific counterpart, which he then does not even bother to prove, suggests to the reader that this scientific counterpart wants merely to produce wished-for, predetermined results and should therefore not be taken seriously as a scientist. In this way we leave the area of scientific

argumentation and enter the area of political agitation.

– The assertion that all revisionists want to white-wash the Hitler regime is wrong. Neither the founder of revisionism, Paul Rassinier, a former member of the French resistance who was imprisoned by the National Socialists in several concentration camps, nor Dr. Robert Faurisson, who was once involved in the political left, nor Serge Thion, nor the American Jew David Cole, to mention only a few, want to white-wash the Hitler regime. The same applies to me.

– He who stays in a glass house should not throw stones.

3.3. Instytut Ekspertyz Sadowych im. Prof. dra Jana Sehna, Fax to G. Rudolf, March 28, 1995, 12:45 hours

Honored Sir!

In summarizing the foregoing correspondence, we would like to state that we have been and are completely aware that in our researches on the structures of the former concentration camp Auschwitz-Birkenau the cyanide content was not completely determined. We especially excluded the disputed Prussian Blue (the chemical formulas of which are more complicated). However, the presence of cyanide compounds other than Prussian Blue, which we have found in structures where the use of Zyklon B has been claimed, shows clearly that these structures had been in contact with these compounds. That is the point of our work.

The work we have begun will be continued.

We found the expressions on the revisionists in publications that we cited (*Amoklauf*[\[121\]](#) J.C. Pressac[\[122\]](#)). They were necessary for the Polish reader because this topic is completely unknown among us. Without this information the purpose of our research would not be understood.

With friendly greetings

3.4. To Messrs. Markiewicz, Gubala and Łabędź

G. Rudolf, April 7, 1995

First, thank you very much for your brief answer of March 28 to my last

letter. Let me comment on the points discussed:

You write that the expressions that you have taken from exterminationist publications on the revisionists were necessary to enable the Polish reader to understand the purpose of your work. According to this, the purpose of your research is to combat the presumed tendency of revisionists to white-wash the Hitlerite system. You also want to prevent that the onus on the Hitler system might be mitigated by certain research results. This is, however, not a scientific intention, but solely a political one. I would like to remind you that you as a researcher should have an interest in finding the best-possible approximation to the truth and not in incriminating or exonerating some system which has disappeared long time ago. Although it has become a ritual in our time to proclaim the nastiness and evil of the Hitler regime over and over again and to damn up one side and down the other anything that would make it less so, that does not alter the fact that this is a seriously unscientific mode of operation. If science determines that the Hitler regime is not culpable in a particular point, one has to accept this even though one might not like it on political grounds.

I am particularly amazed that you would claim that the blanket political suspicions and vilifications to which the exterminationists expose revisionists are “information” necessary for the Polish reader. When you write a scientific article on any certain theme you should be capable of distinguishing between scientific arguments and political demagoguery. The latter does not belong in a scientific piece.

If you really wish to enlighten the uninformed Polish reader on this topic, then it would have been better, for example, to discuss the following points for him, so that he could understand the background of the detection of cyanide in masonry:

1. Since the 1920's until the end of the World War II, Zyklon B has been the most often used insecticide against all kinds of pests (lice, bedbugs, corn beetles, wood worms etc.).
2. During World War II, Germany and her allies consumed many thousands of tons of Zyklon B in order to combat these pests in military as well as civilian facilities (pest control in barracks, food storage areas, ships, trains, prisoner-of-war camps, work camps, and concentration camps).
3. In the Auschwitz camp, devastating typhus epidemics occurred repeatedly. This disease is carried by the louse. To combat the louse,

inmate barracks and all other habitable places in Auschwitz as well as all prisoner's belongings including their clothing were repeatedly deloused with Zyklon B.

4. Relative to its camp population, the Auschwitz camp, the only one in which it is claimed that there were mass killings with Zyklon B, did not receive noticeably more Zyklon B than other camps. The established research assumes therefore that even at Auschwitz 95% to 98% of all Zyklon B deliveries were used for harmless delousing purposes.

5. In Auschwitz the SS spent many million Reichsmarks (many [tens of] millions of DM/Euro by today's values) to erect up-to-date facilities for pest-control and prevention of epidemics – unfortunately not before 1943, so that the earlier devastating typhus epidemics claimed tens of thousands of victims.

This basic knowledge is absolutely necessary for the reader in order to understand the significance of Zyklon B. Today all we hear about this agent is that it was exclusively or principally used in Auschwitz to killing people. Naturally, viewed from this distorted angle the detection of small traces of cyanide in underground morgue 1 of crematorium II in Auschwitz-Birkenau, the alleged homicidal gas chamber – which I have found not to be reproducible –, is taken as evidence that people were killed there.

It is furthermore a fact that even the exterminationist premise of a 98% use of Zyklon B for pest control suggests a probability of exactly these 98% that the traces of cyanide we find today come from simple pest control operations – apart from any quantitative considerations that I will not repeat here. The use of Zyklon B in Auschwitz does not in itself signify killing of people, although you have portrayed it that way in your article.

If you would like to enlighten the Polish reader, I would like to ask you to explain this one thing: How could the Zyklon B have gotten into the underground morgue 1 of crematorium III in Auschwitz-Birkenau, the alleged homicidal gas chamber? The witnesses describe three or four insertion holes in the roof of that cellar. It should have been obvious to you from your researches in the ruins of this cellar that those holes are simply not there. This cellar was allegedly the most intensively operated homicidal gas chamber of the Third Reich, and it is basically still intact. On this point one must concede to Prof. Faurisson when he says, “No holes, no ‘Holocaust!’”

4. Final Remarks

Many people, both experts and laymen, rely naively upon the findings of the Jan Sehn Institute for Forensic Research in Krakow, *i.e.*, the study published in 1994 by Prof. Markiewicz and colleagues. These Polish scientists, however, tested their samples with analytical methods that were unable to detect long-term stable iron cyanide compounds. They did this because they could not imagine how such stable iron cyanide compounds could form. It is, of course, no shame to fail to understand something initially. Anyone, however, who makes a claim of working scientifically must, before making statements upon the subject, at least attempt to investigate and understand. But not so the Polish scientists. They assert their lack of understanding as a justification for their failure to act. Has anyone ever heard that failure to understand a phenomenon was any reason for scientists *not* to study it? To the Polish scientists, this was obviously the case. It would only be permissible to exclude Iron Blue from the study if it were possible to *exclude*, with practical certainty, that the effects of hydrogen cyanide on masonry could result in the formation of iron cyanide, and, consequently, Iron Blue, and if there were at least some indication that these rooms had been painted with Iron Blue. The Polish scientists completely neglected to do this. And even worse: they did not even attempt to refute my arguments on the formation of stable iron cyanide compounds which I published in early 1993.[\[123\]](#) They were familiar with this publication, because they quoted it, but not in order to discuss my arguments, but simply to condemn it flatly as an example of the allegedly diabolical deeds of the “deniers” and the “whitewashers” of Hitler, who Prof. Markiewicz and his colleagues intended to refute – so their own words. This should suffice to show that the actions of these Poles were ideologically motivated to a high degree. If they had been neutral scientists, they would have applied the correct and interpretable method of analysis and would have discussed my publications in a scholarly manner instead of worrying about Hitler’s dirty laundry.

Prof. Markiewicz and his colleagues did not even attempt to find any explanation for the high iron cyanide concentration in the walls of the disinfestation chambers and their blotchy-blue surfaces.

Although they had sought out an analytical method able to produce the results desired by them, the results of their first series of tests were obviously so disturbing that they decided to suppress them and never published them. These data only became public knowledge through an act of indiscretion in

1991.

The Polish scientists therefore rejected the undesired results of their first series of tests and took more samples, until they finally produced the results that fitted in with their preconception: this time, both the samples from the disinfestation chamber and the alleged gas chambers showed cyanide residues on the same order of magnitude.

Let me quote Prof. A.R. Butz, who made an appropriate metaphor to emphasize the degree of intellectual dishonesty revealed by Markiewicz and his colleagues:[\[124\]](#)

“The argument [of Markiewicz et al. for excluding Iron Blue from their analyses], to the extent that it was intelligible enough to be summarized at all, was that they did not understand how the iron-cyanide compounds got to be there, so they decided to ignore them in reaching their conclusions. I don’t understand how the moon got there, so I will ignore all effects associated with it, such as tides. I hope I don’t drown.”

But even Prof. Markiewicz and his colleagues, during the test fumigations performed by them, at least confirmed that moist cement mortar (as was used in the morgues of crematoria II and III) absorbs at least ten times more hydrogen cyanide than dry lime mortar (as used in the disinfestation chambers), as I had assumed for my calculations in my own expert report.

Not even a direct confrontation with my arguments and the open expression of suspected fraud could move Prof. Markiewicz and his colleagues to justify or correct their unscientific behavior. The director of this group, Dr. Jan Markiewicz, who was not a chemist, but rather, a “Technical Testing Specialist,” died in 1997. Both the other authors have remained silent.

One can after all understand that these Polish authors, who made their careers in Communist Poland and, as Polish patriots, can under no circumstances permit the undermining of “Auschwitz” as a moral justification for the Polish ethnic cleansing of East Prussia, East Pomerania, and Silesia after the end of World War II and the greatest land robbery of modern history, as a result of which some three million Germans lost their lives. Many Poles might fear in their hearts that the post-war state of Poland stands and falls with Auschwitz. This may explain Prof. Markiewicz’s and his colleagues’ scientific contortions, but it fails to be a justification. Even the possible circumstance that the responsible scientist assigned to the topic was not a chemist and that his laboratory was perhaps not equipped up to

Western standards, cannot explain this, since an analysis of the total cyanide content is not expensive in terms of laboratory equipment and the chemistry involved is anything but complicated.

The manner with which the Polish scientists approached the problem, however, gives rise to serious suspicion that this was an attempt at scientific fraud, a suspicion which is also supported by the fact that they were unable to justify their incorrect methods of analysis except through their incompetence and intentional ignorance.

The conclusion to be drawn from the above is clear: the only “scientific” attempt to refute Fred A. Leuchter’s sensational argument proves, upon closer examination, to be one of the greatest scientific falsifications of the 20th century.

How desperate must one really be, if it is believed necessary to stoop to such methods in an attempt to defend the established version of the Holocaust, *i.e.*, the alleged systematic extermination of Jews in homicidal gas chambers?

Green sees Red

By Germar Rudolf

Another strange story is that of Richard Green, a PhD Chemist with a similar educational background as I have. The layman would expect two experts with similar educational background to come to similar conclusions in questions relating to their expert knowledge. But this is only partly the case. The reason for this may be Green's political prejudices, which I will highlight in the following.

1. Political Polemics

In spring of 1998 American Chemist Dr. Richard J. Green published papers on the Internet,[\[125\]](#) which criticized the *Leuchter Report*[\[126\]](#) and my own expert report on the gas chambers of Auschwitz.[\[127\]](#) These articles are characterized as follows:

1. Green repeats arguments of Deborah Lipstadt,[\[128\]](#) for example the stupid, unscientific claim that there should be no debate with "Holocaust deniers."
2. He argues that Leuchter didn't have the formal qualifications he claimed to have, which is not true[\[129\]](#) and is also irrelevant for the matters at issue.
3. He cannot understand why I have been using several pen names, even though he admits that I am unacceptably persecuted because of my views.
4. Green imputes that the freedom of expression as granted by the First Amendment of the United States would be lost if "people like Rudolf and his hero Remer ever to come to power here." I cannot speak for General Remer, who died in October 1997, but regarding my person this is not only wrong, it is a libel. And furthermore: General Remer is not my hero. He was a defendant who had a right for unrestricted defense as every defendant. I was merely called to testify in his court case as an expert witness. By describing Remer as my hero, Green obviously intends to link me to Remer's political convictions.
5. Finally, Green labels my arguments "deceptions:"
 "Owing to the fact that he [Rudolf] actually has some understanding

of chemistry many of his deceptions are more sophisticated than other Holocaust deniers. Nonchemists should be somewhat careful in addressing his arguments. Ultimately, he engages in the same deceptions and specious arguments as Leuchter and Lüftl, but the case he makes for those deceptions and arguments involves more difficult chemistry.”

But even if I made mistakes – nobody is perfect – that does not mean that I intended to deceive anybody. This insinuation of bad intentions, unfortunately to be found on either sides of this debate, has as a prerequisite the strong believe of the insinuator that he holds the one and absolute truth, and on the other side has as a consequence that the opposite side is being restricted in their rights, namely by not being granted of having scientific valid arguments, by denying them to participate in discussions and debates. As a final step their human rights of freedom of expression and freedom of science are restricted, as we can see in many European countries already today. And indeed, Green strongly insists that his views of historical events are “historical fact,” that what the Revisionists are doing is “pseudoscience” or “pseudoscientific,” spreading “distasteful and false propaganda.” Even if it “ought to be permitted to spread untruth, [this] does not make untruth into truth.” He imputes that we are happy to “spread a bit of confusion to obfuscate the truth”; that we are telling a “lie” which he intends to “expose” as such.

At the end of his polemic attacks, Green himself summarizes the point I just made, thus giving us a perfect example for a logic that ostracizes dissenters:

“I am not embarrassed to call Holocaust-denial hate speech. That is what it is. People who are smart enough to obfuscate using pseudoscientific arguments are also smart enough to know what they are doing: propagating a lie. Although some people may be attracted to Holocaust denial because of gullibility and/or mental illness, these people are not the same people who write these clever but mendacious pseudoscientific reports. The people who write these reports are motivated by a desire to rehabilitate Nazism, an ideology of hate. Hate-speech is what it is, and in calling it that I am merely exercising my right of free speech.”

Here we have it: Hate speech. Imputing that I want to rehabilitate the incarnation of evil on earth – and that is what National Socialism is in the

eyes of the vast majority of all people – and that I am using evil techniques for this purpose, and that all those who believe I am right must be either mentally ill or feeble-minded. In the long run, that sort of arguing drives us directly into mental asylums, prisons, or onto pyres, a situation which unfortunately is no longer unlikely in Germany today.[\[130\]](#) Green's statements are real hate speech, and unfortunately it is politically correct and thus supported by nearly everybody. And by the way: Even if it were true that some of us would like to rehabilitate National Socialism – I trust that this is only a minority –, this is not an argument against the validity of our arguments.

Reacting to this, Green stated with malicious dialectics:[\[131\]](#)

“And what exactly is ‘real hate speech?’ It seems it is hate speech to label someone’s speech ‘hate speech.’ If that is the case, he [Rudolf] engages in hate speech by his own definition. If labeling speech ‘hate speech’ is the equivalent of censorship, then Rudolf is a censor.”

This is pure nonsense, because first of all I have never supported and would never support any kind of censorship, even if it is “hate speech.” Second, I did not call Dr. Green's speech “hate speech” because he was labeling my speech “hate speech,” but because he is claiming that we revisionists are morally inferior, because we are allegedly using all sorts of evil techniques in order to rehabilitate what he in his first article called the ideology of hate. Green did not prove that I or other revisionists intend to rehabilitate the reign of hate, and he could not succeed in proving it. He is just claiming it, and by doing so, he exposes us to the utmost hate of the world. Hence he is inciting the hatred of the world against us. That is what I call a hate speech: A speech with unfounded and wrong claims that results in the world hating something or somebody. If somebody would say something like the following without presenting supportive evidence:

“All Jews are lying and obfuscating the truth in order to establish the worldwide reign of hatred.”

I assume that Dr. Green would agree with me that this is hate speech. But if one writes without prove:

“All revisionists are lying and obfuscating the truth in order to establish the worldwide reign of hatred.”

– then this is supposed to be appropriate?

On the other hand, Richard Green's ways of arguing are evidence that he has a strong political motivation himself, which may twist the way he

perceives reality: apparently he is an extreme opponent of *any* historical rehabilitation of National Socialism. But that sort of motivation must not influence our scientific arguing, since it is purely political in nature. The results of our scientific research must not depend on the effects they might have on the cleanliness of the moral or criminal record of any historical person or political ideology. It is highly unscientific to let one's research results be guided by the potential political impact it can have.

A follow-up paper by Green indicates that he has not understood the fundamental prerequisites of the scientific method and a civilized dispute. He states that there “cannot be a real debate between those who seek to understand history and those who seek to obfuscate it” and “that accurate information must be presented so that the gullible will not be taken in by those who wish to whitewash the Nazi regime.”

Large parts of Green's second paper consist of personal attacks against me, to which I responded appropriately.[\[132\]](#) Because I do not want to waste paper for this Greenish mud slinging, the interested reader shall be referred to my paper as it is posted on the Internet. I merely want to stress two points:

Green considers it to be honorable and politically necessary to remember the victims of the Jewish Holocaust. Similarly, I consider it just as honorable and politically necessary to remember the victims of the Holocaust committed against Germans during the ethnic cleansing of eastern Germany after World War II. As a son of a father who had been expelled from his home in Silesia after the war, I was temporarily involved in associations and political parties close to the interests of German expellees. For Green this is proof that I am a political right-winger. He therefore concludes:

“Rudolf's credentials as a non-dogmatic and objective seeker of truth must be called into question.”

Green's view seems to be that commemorating massacres against Jews is good, commemorating massacres against Germans, however, is bad. This proves that Green is nothing but an ordinary anti-German racist.

Everyone has his own political views. But the reputation of a scientist does not depend on his political views, but on the formal and scientific quality of his work. Part of this quality is that he does *not* suspect his scientific opponents politically. After all, I do not write that Green is a Jew and associates with left-wing extremists,[\[133\]](#) which is why he should be rejected as biased and his arguments should be ignored.

How characterless Green is indeed, is demonstrated by his attacks against

me for associating with individuals, who are – in most cases unjustly – labeled with all sorts of political swear words in the media. Most of these individuals attacked by Green have assisted me with my works or offered help, protection, and shelter at times, when I had to flee my home country because of the ever growing tide of persecution against me. Whatever the views of these individuals may be, I would be a scoundrel if I would turn away from them or even against them just because they are reviled by media and politicians. After all, it is not political views that determine the quality of humans, but virtues like: wisdom, justice, courage, modesty, altruism, loyalty, and honesty. My refusal to distance myself from acquaintances and friends I gained in times of despair provoked the following response by Greens:[134]

“Rudolf is not willing to call Nazis evil.”

This was the bottom of the pit of malice. But no matter how many of the persons, with which I associate, are actually National Socialists, Green has apparently not understood the western system of justice: A person is evil in a legal sense only if found guilty for a crime, and then only in the context of this crime. Not all National Socialists and those supporting them – the vast majority of all Germans between 1933 and 1945 – have committed crimes nor were they in average any more evil than other humans anywhere else. Not even Green can claim that, or does he? Thus, a sweeping argument of “Nazis are evil” exposes his tendency to jump to prejudiced conclusions and to call for collective responsibility and punishment. I do indeed refuse to make any such sweeping statements, be it “Nazis are evil,” “Communists are evil,” “Jews are evil,” “Witches are evil,” or what have you. It is Green’s problem when he thinks I have to make such a statement in order to protect my integrity. But if he insists on it, he then cannot argue morally against people saying “Jews are evil,” because those people, too, can come up with arguments to support such a thesis. While certain aspects of Nation Socialism – ideologically and historically – might justly be described as evil – as is the fact for Communism, Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and many other ideologies – this does not justify any sweeping statement.

Nota bene: In a response to my self-defence against his vicious *ad hominem* attacks, Green lambastes me for that as well.[135] So, whereas he has a right to attack me personally, I don’t have a right to defend myself?

2. “No Holes, no ‘Holocaust’”

In his first article, Green spends a few paragraphs on discussing Faurisson's famous quip "No Holes, no 'Holocaust.'" Faurisson's thesis is that there are no holes in the roof of the underground morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau, through which Zyklon B could have been thrown into this basement as claimed by various witnesses. But if these holes do not exist, there was no way to commit the claimed gassings, so that the entire basis collapses on which the Holocaust story rests: witness testimonies.[\[136\]](#)

Green's evidence for the existence of holes in that roof are based on arguments in an article by Michael Shermer Artikel printed in his magazine *Skeptic*, which was reprinted in his book in a slightly revised versions in 1997.[\[137\]](#) I have refuted each and every single one of these alleged evidence in my expert report as early as 1993.[\[138\]](#) Green does not mention this with a single word.[\[139\]](#)

3. Between Chemistry and Alchemy

Although Dr. Green's elaborations are more competent when he turns to chemistry, they are still not characterized by the kind of careful considerations the topic deserves. This topic is about the question of the formation and detectability of Iron Blue, the famous iron cyanide compound of blue color, which *can* develop in masonry upon exposure to hydrogen cyanide, the active ingredient of "Zyklon B." When discussing this topic, I initially wish to correct a few wrong concepts, which stubbornly persist not only, but especially among revisionists.

There are three conceivable explanations for the difference in cyanide content of samples taken, on the one hand, from walls of Zyklon B delousing chambers, that is to say, hydrogen cyanide delousing chambers, which have been preserved to this very day in Auschwitz, Birkenau, Stutthof, and Majdanek (very high content of cyanide), and those taken from walls of the alleged homicidal gas chambers in Auschwitz and Birkenau on the other hand (insignificant cyanide content or none at all). Green lists all three possible explanations:

1. *"The presence of Prussian-Blue [= Iron Blue] staining is a necessary consequence of exposure to HCN and the fact that it is not present in the homicidal chambers proves they were not used for homicidal gassing."* (emphasis added)

This is the way Leuchter argued,² and I agree with Green that this is an

unfounded assumption.

2. *“The Prussian-Blue staining is present for reasons having nothing to do with the exposure to HCN. For example the Austrian chemist Dr. Josef Bailer has suggested it may be a pigment from paint.”*

Even in this point I agree with Green who more or less dismisses Bailer’s unfounded theory.[\[140\]](#)

3. *“The Prussian-Blue staining indeed owes its presence to exposure to HCN, but the conditions under which it formed were not universally present in all facilities exposed to HCN. The rate of Prussian-Blue formation may be very different under the conditions used in homicidal chamber versus the conditions in delousing chambers.”*

And again, I agree with Green that this is the correct approach to this problem. But I strongly disagree when Green continues:

“Answer number one is, of course, untenable. We know that homicidal gassings occurred from historical evidence independently of the chemistry involved.”

First of all, you cannot refute chemical or other findings of the exact sciences with eyewitness accounts, and there is no other evidence apart from eyewitness accounts, the only other existing “evidence,” as far as I know. Green does not even try to give us a clue what “other historical evidence” he is referring to.

Secondly, and most interestingly, this sentence clearly shows that Green will never accept any proof of the exact sciences, which refutes what he believes to be true. It shows that it is impossible to change Green’s opinion about this matter, i.e. his opinion is not a scientific one, but a dogmatic one.

Green is the first exterminationist author who accepts my suggestions of how Iron Blue can be formed from hydrogen cyanide and iron oxides, the latter being a common component of all sorts of mortar, plaster, and concrete. [\[141\]](#) Green even adds some more explanations, which are, however, not worth a discussion in this context. Green criticized my thesis about the chemical mechanism involved, but finally, after some forth and back, forces himself to admit,

“that Rudolf is correct or nearly correct regarding the formation of blue staining in the delousing chambers.”

Of course he has restrict this concession to the delousing chambers, because if he would admit that I am correct all the way, his dogma about the homicidal gas chambers would collapse, and that is something he can

impossibly permit to happen. In the following I want to discuss Green's objections.

Green's biggest disadvantage is that he cannot read German. Thus, he has no knowledge of the findings made during the last years. However, since the second half of 2003, this can no longer be an excuse, because by that time the most important of these publications had appeared in English as well.[\[142\]](#)

3.1. Chemical Conditions

In his first article, Green starts a discussion of the factors influencing the formation process of Iron Blue, like:

1. Water content of the wall (the wetter, the better)
2. reactivity of the iron oxides in the wall (mortar is good, brick bad)
3. temperature of the wall (cool better than warm)
4. pH value (acidity) of the wall (basic better than neutral)
5. HCN concentration the walls were exposed to (the higher the better)
6. time of exposure (the longer the better)
7. other influences, e.g. were the walls rinsed, cleaned, chemically treated, covered by paint, tiles...

Green quits the discussion, however, before getting into details, because he assumes:

“that the kinetics are too difficult to model without resort to experiment.”

Again I do agree with him to a certain degree: An exact answer to the question: “Could long term stable Iron Blue compounds be formed by human gassings, and if so: which amount would be formed?” would indeed require large-scale experiments, for which I do not have the necessary means. At any rate, the widespread assumption that one or several gassings with Zyklon B *automatically* and under *any* circumstances lead to traceable cyanide residues is incorrect.

However, regarding the points 5 and 6 listed above, well-founded assumptions can be made, as I will show further down below. For factors 1 to 4 and 7 listed above one can come to very reliable conclusions both for the delousing chambers as well as for the underground morgues in Auschwitz allegedly misused as homicidal gas chambers by using the known consistency of the building material used and data given in expert literature, which, after all, was one of the main topics of my expert report. Interestingly enough, Green never even attempted to answer the questions he raises by using expert

literature, as I had done, although I asked him to do this several times.

As an example for Green's arrogant ignorance I want to address the question of the pH value of masonry. I agree with him that an alkaline environment is a basic requirement, so that hydrogen cyanide dissolved in water, which is always present in the micropores of the masonry, is converted into soluble cyanide salts. This is the first step toward the later conversion into the long-term stable Iron Blue pigment. In this regard, Green has drawn graphs similar to mine.[\[143\]](#) He then hypothesizes that masonry is actually pH-neutral or even slightly acidic, so that no accumulation of cyanides can be expected. One does not find any references to literature in his paper, which backs up his hypothesis. I then pointed out to him, with reference to expert literature on construction material, that his hypothesis is wrong. The fact is that newly erected masonry based on mortar, cement, or concrete is always alkaline. This is particularly true for the material used to build the morgues under discussion, which remained alkaline for months, if not years. To this, Green simply stated:

“The IFRC [Institute for Forensic Research, Cracow = Jan Sehn Institute], on the other hand measured [in 1993] the pH [of mortar samples from the alleged homicidal gas chambers] to be between 6 and 7 [that is neutral or slightly acid].”

Instead of consulting expert literature, Dr. Green asked for advice from the researchers of the Jan Sehn Institute. The problem with the value determined by the Jan Sehn Institute is, however, that it was measured 50 years after said walls were built. If Dr. Green had only the slightest idea about the chemistry of masonry material, he would know that mortars and concrete do of course not stay alkaline eternally. If he would have read or understood my expert report thoroughly, he would have noticed that I even quoted a PhD thesis to this effect. This thesis determined in the 1960s the speed, with which the front of carbonatization (= front of neutralization) progresses into samples of mortar and concrete.[\[144\]](#)

Not even a PhD chemist has to know all of this, because the chemistry of masonry material is a special area, which is not usually part of the curriculum of a chemistry department at any university. I had to teach myself about that topic with the help of expert literature before I could understand it. It therefore does not come as a surprise that Dr. Green has no knowledge about these issues. But it indicates a great deal of intellectual dishonesty that he simply ignores my repeated references to his mistakes and to the appropriate

expert literature[\[145\]](#) and instead refers to analytical results, which are utterly irrelevant already because they were gained from samples taken 50 years after the walls under discussion were built.

In order to make the reader see how flawed Dr. Green's way of arguing is, let me say it in a parable:

By referring to a couple of Italian expert pizza baking instructions, I showed that a pizza, when taken out of the oven, is hot or warm for quite a while (one hour). Now, Dr. Green comes along claiming that I am wrong because a science friend of his has just now measured the temperature of a pizza which was baked a week ago, and which has been lying around somewhere since. And this scientist found out that this pizza is indeed cold right now. Surprise, surprise!

That I have to deal with that kind of alleged "refutation" of my arguments clearly shows, onto which level Dr. Green must have declined to keep the illusion that his claims are somehow cogent.

3.2. Concentrations of Poison Gas

Initially Dr. Green assumed a wrong evaporation speed of the hydrogen cyanide from the carrier material of Zyklon B. After I made him aware of the evidence proving him wrong,[\[146\]](#) he corrected this and even conceded that the execution times claimed by basically all witnesses are said to have been very short. Yet Green refused to admit the unavoidable consequence of this: that very short execution times require high concentrations of poison gas. He simply assumes that amounts of Zyklon B were used as testified to by a few witnesses, which is comparable to the amount used in delousing chambers. Due to the slow evaporation of hydrogen cyanide, however, the actual concentration obtained during the first decisive minutes of the alleged homicidal gassing would have been only a few percent of what eventually developed in delousing chambers after several hours. Green ignored that this would not have led to the fast execution as testified to by the witnesses. Green also ignores the only reliable data available in this regard: executions in U.S. gas chambers for capital punishment.[\[147\]](#)

3.3. Ventilation

In order to minimize the time, during which hydrogen cyanide would have been in contact with the basement walls of the alleged homicidal gas chambers, Green claims contrary to the facts that the ventilation systems

installed in these morgues of crematoria II & III were capable of cleaning these rooms from poison gas within 20 to 30 minutes to such a degree that this would have allowed heavy labor in the morgues without wearing gas masks and protective suits.[\[148\]](#) He obtains his unrealistic short ventilation times by:

a) Assuming a low amount of poison gas applied, contrary to witness statements about very short execution times.

b) Exaggerating the capacity of the ventilation system.

c) Not taking into consideration several toxicological facts, like for example that the incorporation of lethal amounts of a poison is not identical with the occurrence of death. In most cases, death actually occurs much later. In the case under discussion, a swift death can be obtained only with large overdoses of the poison. Green also neglects the fact that the successful murder of all victims (lethal dose 100%, LD₁₀₀) requires much more poison than the threshold value given in toxicological literature, which is meant to be a lower risk level in order to save lives (lethal dose 1%, LD₁).

d) Ignoring that there were no holes in the roof of these underground morgues, into which some obscure “Zyklon B introduction devices” could have been installed as claimed by witness Michał Kula.[\[149\]](#) These devices are claimed to have allowed the removal of the Zyklon B from the alleged gas chamber after the execution was over. After all, if the Zyklon B would not have been removed, it would have kept releasing its poison gas into the chamber, thus preventing a speedy, successful ventilation of the chamber.

After I had pointed out to Dr. Green with the help of documents that his data given for the capacity of the ventilation system is wrong,[\[150\]](#) he merely replied:

“Regarding the performance of the ventilation system, it simply does not matter.”

It is that easy: If I successfully proved him wrong, he simply ignores it and continues as if nothing has happened.

3.4. Rigorous Ignorance

Equipped with such a lack of knowledge and an ignorance that can hardly be surpassed, Dr. Green meant that three conditions must be met before he could accept my thesis:

“Until Rudolf and Leuchter can demonstrate rigorously [a] that the pigments found on the delousing chamber are indeed the result of

exposure to HCN, and [b] that the kinetics involved with the formation of such pigments dictate that significant quantities should be formed in all of the homicidal gas chambers, and [c] that these pigments could not possibly have degraded over time, their ‘forensic reports’ remain unsupported speculation.”

In the subsequent discussion, Green acknowledged that I succeeded to rigorously prove the conditions here marked with a) and c), so that he gave in this regard.[\[151\]](#)

Green’s condition here marked with b) is nonsense, because what does “all of the homicidal gas chambers” mean, if the properties of “all of the homicidal gas chambers” cannot be determined due to a lack of definition? And what exactly does “dictate” mean, if we cannot possibly know the exact conditions of the claimed homicidal gassings, because the witnesses contradict each other and also contradict both material facts and technical possibilities? Nothing rigorous can be built upon such a flimsy base.

My approach was therefore different, namely a comparison of the presumed conditions during the alleged homicidal gassings with those that prevailed in the delousing chambers, where the formation of Iron Blue was indubitably the result of gassings with Zyklon B. The differences between both cases were then assessed using known factors that influence the formation of Iron Blue.

The fact of the matter is that the conditions for the formation of Iron Blue were much more favorable in case of the alleged homicidal gas chambers of the crematoria II and III in Birkenau than in the case of the delousing chambers located in the buildings BW5a and BW5b in the same camp:

- the alleged homicidal gas chambers were located underground;
- they were unheated and thus cool and moist;
- they possessed a cement plaster, which has an extremely high inner surface liable to intensely absorb any kind of substances
- their cement plaster also remained alkaline for an extended period of time;
- their walls were not coated with any kind of paint or coating;
- and they are said to have been put into operation right after it was finished.

In contrast to that are the delousing chambers:

- located above ground;
- heated, which means that their walls were relatively dry (in

particular the internal wall separating the delousing chamber from the rest of the building);

- mortar and plaster consisted of lime mortar with a relatively low inner surface (=low tendency to absorb substances);
- their plaster and mortar also set rather quickly, that is, it quickly lost its alkalinity.

I therefore cannot see any reason why the formation of iron cyanides should be less likely to occur in the morgues under consideration than in the delousing chambers. But that is, of course, not automatically so for any room exposed to hydrogen cyanide, or for “all of the homicidal gas chambers,” to use Green’s words.

Already in 1994 I reported about a case where the newly applied plaster of the protestant church of Meeder-Wiesefeld in Bavaria, Germany, developed massive blue staining several months after it had been gassed with Zyklon B.[\[152\]](#) A short while later I managed to gain access to the files of the construction company responsible for this case. From this it can be concluded that the conditions of this church were very similar to those that would have prevailed in the alleged homicidal underground gas chambers in Auschwitz: cool, unheated, and moist walls freshly plastered with an alkaline cement plaster.

To this add the fact that without a single exception *all* Zyklon B delousing chambers of the Third Reich era still in existence today, whose walls were not covered with a gastight coating – two in the Majdanek and one in the Stutthof camp[\[153\]](#) – exhibit the very same patchy blue discolorations and the very same analytical results as the delousing chambers in Auschwitz and Birkenau as well as those of the church in Bavaria mentioned above. How then could Dr. Green initially claim that it is not certain that the massive Iron Blue residues in these delousing chambers are the result of exposure to hydrogen cyanide, that is, gassings with Zyklon B? And who could not be impressed by the similarity of the conditions of the Bavarian church and the alleged homicidal underground morgues in



In August 1976, the Protestant church at D-96484 Meeder-Wiesefeld was fumigated with Zyklon B. Subsequently, blue-colored stains appeared all over the plaster.

Birkenau? This striking similarity almost forces the conclusion that we ought to expect similar chemical reactions, too.

After I pointed out this case of a Bavarian church to Dr. Green, he simply played the infamous three monkeys, claiming that he would return to it later, but he never did that as far as I know. All he tried was an evasive maneuver by claiming that this one case of a Bavarian church was an exception, therefore it proves that blue discolorations do normally *not* occur. What Dr. Green misses, though, is the fact that the conditions of mass gassings in delousing chambers and alleged homicidal gas chambers during the Third Reich era were not “normal” in terms of being comparable to the usual application of Zyklon B. Zyklon B was and is usually used only in single occasions in buildings that have been severely infested with vermin. Such an infestation does not usually occur in newly erected – or renovated – buildings. After all, a severe infestation usually occurs only after a building has been in use for years or decades. The mortar and plaster of such buildings, however, would have been much less inclined to react with hydrogen cyanide than buildings especially – or allegedly – built for no other purpose than to be repeatedly or even continuously exposed to this gas right after they had been erected: the delousing chambers and alleged homicidal gas chambers of the Third Reich. As indicated above, all of these delousing chambers developed such blue staining.

As also indicated above, my reasoning does of course not offer absolute certainty, because too many factors are uncertain due to unreliable and untrustworthy witness statements. But considering the known factors in connection with what would have been technically possible, I think it is reasonable to conclude that the claimed homicidal gassings are incongruent with the material evidence. This conclusion is not only based on chemical arguments, but in particular also on technical and architectural facts. I therefore also conclude that chemistry is not the science, which can prove or refute any allegations about the Holocaust “rigorously,” as for example the genetic fingerprint is capable of rigorously proving or refuting the fatherhood of a man. The data we have is simply not reliable enough for that.

In his epistemological ignorance, Green repeated my above statement triumphantly by claiming, I had distanced myself from my own expert report and would now claim that chemistry is an “inexact science.” He made fun of me, because he stated that chemistry is, after all, an “exact science,” so that one could expect exact results from it.

This episode proves the infantile state of mind of Dr. Green. After all, the term “exact science” does not mean that all the results of such a science are exact (or rigorous) in a mathematical sense, that is, with no margin of error. The term “exact science” is used as a generic term summarizing all natural sciences as well as technical sciences, in opposition to the social sciences like historiography, sociology, etc. The term is derived from the methods used by these sciences, which are exact in nature, in contrast to those of the social sciences, which are often speculative. It has nothing to do with the actual research results of these sciences. The lack of rigorosity or exactitude of the chemical conclusions of my research are caused exactly by the fact that during my research I had to operate with results obtained with the speculative methods of social sciences, namely uncritically recorded witness testimonies.

4. Moral Capitulation

After assessing all factors, Dr. Green finally had to admit that the formation of Iron Blue in the walls of rooms exposed to hydrogen cyanide is indeed possible. He also conceded that the high content of cyanide residues in the walls of the delousing chambers in the Auschwitz, Birkenau, Majdanek, and Stutthof camps is exactly the result of such gassings.

By so doing, Dr. Green also admitted indirectly that the analytic method used by the Jan Sehn Institute in Krakow was wrong. As a brief reminder: the Krakow scientists had intentionally chosen an analytic method incapable of detecting long-term stable cyanides of the Iron Blue type in order to prevent that they detect blue wall paint. They ignored all arguments known to them, which refute their thesis of a blue wall paint, and did nothing to verify their wall paint thesis. But by excluding Iron Blue from their analyses, they excluded exactly the one cyanide compound, which is the only one that can be expected to be found 50 years later.[\[154\]](#)

Because Dr. Green agrees with me that the thesis of the Krakow scientists about the blue wall paint is profoundly wrong, it should be expected that he also agrees with my conclusion that the Krakow scientists chose the wrong analytic method and that they should repeat their analyses with the proper method. But that is not the case. Instead, Green created an auxiliary hypothesis bordering at the insane: He invented a scenario during which items “soaked with aqueous solutions of HCN” were allegedly leaned against such walls, hence causing blue stains.[\[155\]](#) The problem with that claim is

that “aqueous solutions of HCN” didn’t exist. Infact, treating garments with such self-made solutions would have been extremely dangerous.

In other words: Green makes up wild stories so he can continue his support for the Krakow pseudo-scientists’ exclusion of Iron Blue from their analyses. But since Green does not claim that any blue paint or “HCN-soaked items” was used in the homicidal gas chambers, what exactly is it that justified the exclusion of the one chemical compound that is most likely to be found after 50 years? This makes no sense at all, except perhaps that he does not want to expose his exterminationist friends from the Jan Sehn Institute as what they really are: imposters.

Additionally and more generally, Dr. Green should also say that the Krakow scientists neither tried to understand what they claimed not to have understood, nor discussed the attempts to understand as made by others, which were known to them. No matter which results the Krakow scientists produced and what their scientific opinion might have been: their behavior is extremely unscientific, as **the most important task of a scientist is to try to understand what has not been understood so far, and to discuss the attempts of others to make understandable.** The Krakow scientists did just the opposite: they decided to ignore and exclude what they did not understand. Finally, in their article as well as in a letter to me, the Polish scientists themselves stated that the purpose of their paper was to refute the “Holocaust Deniers” and to prevent Hitler and National Socialism from being whitewashed, that is to say, their purpose was *not* to find out the truth! Thus, by their own confession, they used unscientific methods in order to produce desired results for the purpose of achieving certain political goals.

And the amazing thing about Dr. Green is that he – and with him all those who relies on him[\[156\]](#) – does not only defend Prof. Markiewicz’s behavior in every regard, but he attacks me for my critique against the Polish scientists, while omitting *all the reasons* I gave for doing so. To crown this, Dr. Green even defends the fact that Prof. Markiewicz never even bothered to address any of my critique, even though addressing critiques is paramount for scientists. Dr. Green argues:

“Rudolf complains that Markiewicz et al. have not responded to his queries. Why should they do so? What credibility does Rudolf have, that demands they answer his every objection no matter how ill-founded?”

However, since Dr. Green agrees that the Iron Blue detectable in the walls of delousing chambers is the result of gassings with Zyklon B, he himself has

indirectly admitted that all my objections against Markiewicz's method of analysis are well-founded, that is, just the opposite of "ill-founded."

And why does Dr. Green think I bear no credibility demanding a discussion of any of my arguments? Not because I lack scientific qualifications. No, he thinks I am an abomination because of my (merely alleged) views, and because I have been subject to social persecution and political prosecution, leading to the total destruction of my social existence, my reputation, and finally my freedom. Dr. Green even resorts to calling me a "liar," "obfuscator," and "hater" because of my different well-founded opinions.

The scheme is as follows: first, people like Dr. Green attempt to do everything to destroy my reputation by name-calling, persecution, and prosecution, and when they succeed, they claim that there is no need to discuss anything with me anymore, since I do not have any reputation and credibility anyway. This way they can nicely ignore any argument refuting their flawed thesis. And they have the chutzpah to call themselves righteous scientists and to call me a pseudo-scientific liar and obfuscator of the truth.

Dr. Green unconditionally defends the scientific frauds from the Krakow institute, and both get away with it, because in the eyes of the public, both have the "politically correct" "scientific" opinion about Auschwitz. Birds of the same feather flock together.

An Accountant Poses as Cremation Expert

By Carlo Mattogno

I. Preliminary Observation

In October 1999 John C. Zimmerman published a tendentious article with the title “Body Disposal at Auschwitz: The End of the Holocaust Denial”[\[157\]](#) directed against my study of cremations at Auschwitz. I responded to his unfounded accusation with my article “John C. Zimmerman and ‘Body Disposal at Auschwitz’: Preliminary Observations,”[\[158\]](#) in which I documented Zimmerman’s historical, technical, and documentary incompetence as well as his obvious bad faith. He immediately reacted to my response by attacking me with another arrogant article, “My Response to Carlo Mattogno,”[\[159\]](#) in which his imposture was raised to a systematic level.

In return I swiftly wrote a long and detailed rebuttal “Supplementary Response to John C. Zimmerman on his ‘Body disposal at Auschwitz,’”[\[160\]](#) in which I unmasked all of Zimmerman’s lies one by one. This reply dating from August 2000 was published on the Website of Russell Granata, who unfortunately deceased on August 14, 2004.[\[161\]](#) At the end of October 2000, Zimmerman promised by e-mail that he would respond to my rebuttal within six months. Almost five years have past by now, but John C. Zimmerman remained silent.

In 2000 he published a book[\[162\]](#) that contains various critiques against me, but they are a mere repetition of the lies contained in his articles mentioned above. He had nothing to say about my final rebuttal. His silence equals an unconditional surrender. It is his admission that his arguments were and remain unfounded and untenable.

Zimmerman claimed to have written a refutation of my arguments concerning corpse cremations at Auschwitz; or better still, even a *definitive* refutation, as he makes clear from the subtitle of his article: “The End of Holocaust-Denial.” Zimmerman disputes my study “The Krematoria Ovens of Auschwitz and Birkenau,”[\[163\]](#) regarding which he writes:

“It appears that this was intended to be the definitive denial argument on the issue.”

This is merely *one* of the grand illusions of our professor. The work he cites is a translation of my article “Die Krematoriumsöfen von Auschwitz,” which was published in the German anthology edited by Ernst Gauss

(=Germar Rudolf), *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*.[\[164\]](#)

That work is a summary (carried out by the editor) of a text of approximately 80 pages, which was a synthesis summary of a larger work that I had compiled by 1993 with the cooperation of Engineer Dr. Franco Deana.[\[165\]](#) “Omissions,” of which Zimmerman accuses me, are the result of the drastic reduction of my original text for that anthology.

Whereas that work arose from a period of limited availability of sources, since 1995 I have had access to a vastly larger amount of material, therefore the article “The Crematoria Ovens of Auschwitz and Birkenau” is not a definite work, as Zimmerman believes, but merely a drastically abridged point of departure.

My “definitive” study concerning cremations at Auschwitz – assuming that I would speak of a “definitive study” – would be the two-volume work currently being prepared for publication: *I forni crematori di Auschwitz. Studio storico-tecnico, con la collaborazione del dott.ing. Franco Deana* (The Cremation Ovens of Auschwitz. A Historical and Technical Study, with the assistance of Dr. Ing. Franco Deana).[\[166\]](#)

The major parts of the objections raised by Zimmerman have already been refuted with ample documentation in that work.[\[167\]](#) But already the last updating of my above-mentioned article, which appeared in 2003,⁸ is sufficient to upset Zimmerman’s historical and technical fantasies.

Actually, our professor has drawn a blank and therefore must start all over again with his “refutation,” but this time his task will be much more difficult.

In this overview, I shall limit myself to raising some preliminary observations.

1. Zimmerman’s Competence

First of all, let us assess the competence of this critic who presents himself as “Associate Professor, University of Nevada, Las Vegas” (p. 1).

The first qualification required of one who wants to seriously occupy himself with the alleged Holocaust is knowledge of the German language, but our professor does not know German, and for interpretations of texts written in that language he has to trust translations by others. He in fact declares:

“The author wishes to thank Judith Jenner and Karola Raab, both of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, for their translations of the German language material used in this study.”

It is as though a professor wanted to explain obscure passages of the Bible without knowing Hebrew and Aramaic! This already qualifies Professor Zimmerman as a dilettante.

From the historiographical point of view, Zimmerman relies for the most part on second-hand information filtered through various authors such as Pressac, Piper, van Pelt, Czech, etc. The original documents known to our professor are few and irrelevant. We shall subsequently show what blunders result from such documentary ignorance.

From the technical point of view, Zimmerman walks in the dark. He has not the faintest idea of the structure and function of crematory ovens in general and those of Auschwitz in particular, going off into absolutely unfounded conjectures as if they were sacred truths. This fact shall be illustrated with appropriate examples.

As to methods and professional honesty, Zimmerman demonstrates a truly worrisome deficiency, and while he charges that Mattogno “basically reverts to the common denier tactics of omission and misrepresentation” – an accusation of specious methods against me – we are about to see just how honest Zimmerman’s “refutations” are.

2. Zimmerman’s Fabrications and Deceptions.

We begin with the case of air photos. First of all, Zimmerman claims that I changed my mind about certain photographs of Auschwitz, which had been published in books. This is absolutely ridiculous. Being a dilettante, he evidently believes that I act like he does by looking for the documents in books and not in the archives.

I possess all the Auschwitz air photos he mentioned (and many others he does not even know or is unaware of), and already since 1989 I also own copies of the surface photos he mentioned.

If I change my opinion concerning interpretation of specific points, then this resulted only from the progression of my studies, and was not due to the fact that later books have published documents, which I had already in my possession.

I will now examine in more detail Zimmerman’s “definitive refutation”:

1. Zimmerman writes that Mattogno

“claimed in 1995, the year following the publication of the May 31 photo, that the smoke was not from burning bodies but most probably

from trash.”

Zimmerman cites as a source my booklet *Auschwitz Holocaust revisionist Jean-Claude Pressac: The “Gassed” People of Auschwitz: Pressac’s New revisions*.[\[168\]](#)

Zimmerman’s claim is false. I never wrote such a thing; not in that booklet nor elsewhere.[\[169\]](#)

2. Our professor claims that “Mattogno simply had no explanation for the presence of this smoke (p. 41).” This is also false; anyone may read my “explanation” on page 43 of my book *My Banned Holocaust Interview*.[\[170\]](#)

3. Regarding the photographic note, which Zimmerman reproduces in his article, he declares that “it is possible to see 14 Sonderkommandos in uniform.” This too is false. The photograph in question shows only 8 persons (almost certainly prisoners) standing, and a 9th [person] on the left, who is probably a guard. As I have explained in *My Banned Holocaust Interview* (pp. 41-44), this photograph does not only *fail to* demonstrate, but also *refutes* the story of mass cremation of “gassed.” This lie serves to advance the number of prisoners in that photograph of “25 Sonderkommandos” declared by Filip Müller.

4. Still, Zimmerman writes that “Mattogno never addressed this photo” (p. 46), to which I respond once again: See *My Banned Holocaust Interview* (pp. 41- 44).

5. He furthermore declares that

“Mattogno had also assured his readers that Red and White Bunkers were not found in any German documents and that they had ‘been created by postwar witness.’”

Here our very virtuous professor falsifies my affirmation. I have in fact written:[\[171\]](#)

“Before examining Jean-Claud Pressac’s statements on Bunkers 1 and 2, it is well to specify that this designation (like those of ‘red house’ and ‘white house’) is not found either in the German documents or in the reports of the clandestine resistance movement of the period at Auschwitz; it has been created by postwar eyewitnesses.”

I referred to *terms*, while Zimmerman declares that I referred to *things*.

6. Our professor of integrity again falsifies my assertions shortly thereafter by claiming that:

“He [Mark van Alstine] has identified three burning pits in the area of the White Bunker (Mattogno states that there were four).”

In reality I referred to traces of four mass graves filled with soil located approximately 200 meters west of area BIII of Birkenau. I did not speak of “burning pits,” of open graves, or of graves “in the area of the White Bunker”; these are simply Zimmerman deceptions.

7. Referring to one of my citations concerning an article by H. Fröhlich entitled “Zur Gesundheitspflege auf den Schlachtfeldern,” Zimmerman wrote that Mattogno

“cited a study by H. Frohlich [sic] in an 1872 German military journal that the attempt to dispose of the bodies of soldiers by opening mass graves and filling them with tar ‘resulted in charring of the uppermost layer of the corpses, the baking of the intermediate layer and no effect on the bottom layer.’ He ignored the fact that the author of the study gave guidelines for the effective disposal of bodies in pits by using gasoline. Frohlich wrote that the grave had to be drenched with gasoline in a tar pit. After three hours, 250 to 300 bodies were disposed of.”

Yet in the pages cited, the military medic Fröhlich expounds a criticism of a disinfestation procedure after the Battle of Sedan, which was carried out by the chemist Créteur, and above all, of the results which he pretended to have obtained. Créteur opened mass graves, poured in liquid tar, which was then ignited. Fröhlich objected that with such a procedure corpses at the bottom of the grave remained practically intact.

One of two passages mentioned by Zimmerman (in reference to his note 278) references a citation by Fröhlich concerning a writing by Créteur, but the “guidelines,” of which he expounds, are those typically critical of the military medics. Moreover this passage does not contain any mention of “gasoline.” The only combustible liquid of which Créteur writes (other than tar) is mineral oil (*Steinöl*), which however served only to ignite the tar:[\[172\]](#)

“Thereupon I ignited the tar with the help of straw soaked in mineral oil.”

The other passage is the citation of a letter appearing in Belgian script, which states that the corpses were soaked with tar and mineral oil which were then ignited.[\[173\]](#) Hence, in the Fröhlich article “gasoline” is never mentioned.

8. To this falsehood, Zimmerman then also adds another deception, writing:

“In 1887 Dr Hugo Erichsen, one of the world’s leading experts in ‘Body Disposal’ in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, wrote of the

Belgian government's efforts along these lines in a battle in 1814. The individual charged with 'Body Disposal' was named Créteur."

In reality, Zimmerman presents the same source – the affirmations of Créteur – as if they were two different sources! This also shows our poor professor making a rather stupid historical chronological blunder: the fact is, of course, that Créteur's activities occurred at the time of the Franco-Prussian War: 1871, not in 1814! And if that is not enough, reporting on the activity of Créteur, Dr. Erichsen – this alleged world expert of cremation – was declaring according to Zimmerman that the corpses of the soldiers were "saturated with kerosene" (p. 44), which is false, because Créteur speaks only of "mineral oil." So here is our Professor Zimmerman, relying upon a world "expert," but he is incapable of distinguishing mineral oil from kerosene!

9. Conclusions Zimmerman draws from things such as the above are only initial examples of his crass ignorance of the subject-matter while assailing me:

"Deniers like Mattogno would have people believe that the Germans of World War II were incapable of replicating the achievements of an early 19th century European country."

If Professor Zimmerman had made a serious research in this regard, then he would have known that the scope of the disinfestation in the battlegrounds never had been the *cremation* of the corpses, but only the more or less complete carbonization of their soft tissue in an attempt to ward off the onset of epidemics. Therefore this concerns completely different problems.

10. Zimmerman affirms that

"Mattogno claimed the maximum cremation capacity of the six original ovens [of Auschwitz Krema I] was 120 per day, even though he was familiar with evidence from another concentration camp that showed a Topf double muffle oven could burn 52 per day or 26 per muffle."

In this case, the Zimmerman falsification consists in the omission of factors which permitted such a higher cremation capacity.[\[174\]](#) I wrote:[\[175\]](#)

"The average cremation time of a continuously operating oven was about forty minutes of principal combustion (in the muffle), obtainable with the aid of the installation of an intake draft system (data relative to the Gusen oven).

The average time of a cremation without an intake draft system (taking into account the combustion capacity of the furnace grill) was sixty minutes, as is evident from the statement by Engineer Prüfer (in the 1

November 1940 letter), as well as from the diagrams published by Engineer R. Kessler concerning the principal combustion in the muffle (considering the structural differences of the Gebrüder Beck oven compared to those at Auschwitz-Birkenau).”

Naturally Zimmerman does not mention the documents I quoted in this passage because they refute categorically his thermotechnical fantasies.

11. To “demonstrate” that Bunker 2 continued to function even after Crematory II at Birkenau started functioning, Zimmerman presents an argument which is truly a masterpiece of deception as well as bad faith. He affirms:

“Another useful piece of information is a report from the Bauleitung on June 13, 1943. It states that doors for Krema II are ‘urgently needed for the execution of the special measures... Likewise, the completion of windows for the reception building and the doors for 5 [barracks] for the accommodation of prisoners [Häftlingsunterkünfte] is urgently required for the same reasons.’ There is no further information about the five barracks in the memo. Recall, however, that Höss mentioned five barracks in his memoirs for the two bunkers in the area where prisoners were gassed, and this is the same number referred to for ‘special treatment’ in the Bauleitung memo of July 15, 1942. It would appear that the five barracks in the June 1943 memo are the same ones used for undressing in the areas where the two bunkers were located. Thus, their continued usage after the crematoria were built and before the Hungarian operation was undertaken is strongly suggested.’”

Well, first of all Zimmerman falsifies the date of that document, which is a letter from the head of the Central Construction Office, Bischoff, to the *Deutsche Ausrüstungswerke* Auschwitz (DAW, German equipment works) dated January 13, 1943.[\[176\]](#) To this falsification Zimmerman then adds an interpretation, which is not only absolutely unfounded, but decidedly ridiculous: the “5 accommodations for prisoners”[\[177\]](#) mentioned in this letter were supposed to have been the alleged “undressing barracks” of the alleged homicidal bunkers. The foundation for this interpretation is the simple presence of the number “5” in the two cited documents and the affirmation of Höss!

Moreover, Zimmerman here furnishes another proof of his ignorance of documents, because “in the Bauleitung memo of July 15, 1942” it is clearly specified that one of the “5 barracks for special treatment and

accommodation of inmates” was meant for the village of Bor, a little settlement located about four km south of Birkenau:[178]

“4 pieces barracks of inmates in Birkenau 1 pc. barracks for accommodation of inm. in Bor.”

So maybe in Bor there was a branch office of the alleged gassing Bunker of Birkenau? The four huts planned for Birkenau were already mentioned as BW 58 in a list of constructions of the camp dated from March 31, 1942. A letter of the head of the Central Construction Office from June 9, 1942, explains that it served “for the accommodation of personal effects [inmate property].”[179]

12. Zimmerman wrote “the total number of prisoners registered in Auschwitz in 1941 is not known,” but the *Kalendarium* of Danuta Czech, which he keeps citing, states explicitly that in 1941 there were 17,270 “registered” (*eingeliefert*) prisoners and 9,997 Soviet captives.[180]

13. Zimmerman declares:

“Mattogno and other deniers often argue that a planned expansion of the camp to 200,000 was the catalyst for the new crematoria. However, the Bauleitung began negotiating with firms for construction of the four crematoria in July 1942, while the first evidence of the planned expansion to 200,000 is on August 15.”

This involves another Zimmerman deception. In the file memo of August 21, 1942, which Zimmerman cites on page 9, one reads (cited from the translation of the Pressac book to which our professor refers):[181]

“Regarding the construction of a 2nd crematorium with 5 3-muffle furnaces, together with the ventilation and air extraction systems, it will be necessary to await the result of negotiations already under way with the Reich Security Main Office [RSHA] on the subject of rationed materials.”

Therefore no decision to construct Crematory II had yet been made.

On this same document there is evidence that the Prüfer proposal to transfer two 8-muffle ovens from Mogilew to Auschwitz was made on August 18. The proposal (proved by a handwritten note in the margin) was accepted by the WVHA on August 24.

So this signifies that the number of oven muffles for Crematory IV and V had not yet been decided upon at that time. Therefore Zimmerman knows he lies.

Regarding augmenting the camp population, the Zimmerman affirmations

are refuted by Pressac, his main source, who writes:[182]

“Himmler had ordered that the camp should accommodate 200,000 inmates, and the Central Construction Office had completed a design for the enlarged camp at the end of July.”

In the original edition of his second book, Pressac declares again more explicitly:[183]

“According to the orders of Himmler and of Kammler, the effective capacity of the POW camp Birkenau was determined to be 200,000 prisoners, which induced a new expansion of the camp and an increase of its cremation capacity. End of July, a fourth sector of 60,000 prisoners was added, located to the south of the first sector, thus increasing the capacity of the camp to 200,000.”

So according to Professor Zimmerman, Pressac is also a “denier”!

3. Zimmerman’s Historical-Documentary Ignorance

14. Zimmerman writes “the Auschwitz Construction Agency, known as the Bauleitung.” In his entire article he always writes “Bauleitung” of Auschwitz. The poor professor has no idea of the fact that the *Bauleitung* (Construction Office) was promoted to *Zentralbauleitung* (Central Construction Office) on November 14, 1941,[184] and remained *Central Construction Office* until the end of the war in 1945.

15. Zimmerman presents another classic example of his historical-documentary ignorance after citing a Topf letter from the Mauthausen *SS-Neubau-leitung* (New Construction Office) of July 14, 1941. He knows this document only from a reference to it in *Kalendarium* by Danuta Czech and its false reproduction in the book by R. Schnabel, *Macht ohne Moral*. [185] Then Zimmerman continues:

“On the same day that the Gusen instructions were issued, two Topf engineers stated that the double muffle furnace could incinerate 60 to 72 bodies [30 to 36 per muffle] in a 20 hour period with three hours of maintenance required.”

This time his source is Pressac’s article “The Machinery of Mass Murder at Auschwitz.”[186] But our poor professor didn’t know that Pressac’s document is exactly the same document mistranslated by R. Schnabel, so Zimmerman thought they were two different documents!

16. Citing Henryk Tauber through Pressac, Zimmerman repeats without

any comment Pressac's foolish claim that in the triple-muffle oven "the flames went first round the two side muffles." This mistake was initiated, as I have explained elsewhere,[187] by a translation error[188] and is technically false.[189] From this one may surmise Professor Zimmerman's comprehension of cremation technology and sources!

17. Zimmerman writes that "Miecyslaw Morawa, a worker in the crematoria, testified that..." But there is no existing testimony from Morawa. Our poor professor, being incapable of correctly interpreting the sources indicated by Danuta Czech in her *Kalendarium of Auschwitz*, had picked up a stupid blunder and confused Morawa with Tauber!

18. Zimmerman writes "the two structures in the wooded area [the alleged Bunkers of Birkenau] were completely destroyed by the Germans and no trace remains." But our professor ignores the fact that there still exist solid traces of what is said to have been Bunker 2 – ruins of the foundation and walls, as seen by visitors to Birkenau.

19. To the question of "Sonderbehandlung," "Sonderaktion," etc., I refer Zimmerman, who only refers to second hand documents, to my study *Special Treatment in Auschwitz. Genesis and Meaning of a Term*.²³ Here is already the first book that awaits its "definitive refutation" by Zimmerman. Our poor professor can not even imagine how many difficulties he would yet have to face in order to be able to "refute" the revisionist writings.

Here I limit myself to a few glaring errors which Zimmerman presents:

In reference to a file memo of August 21, 1942, he declares:

"The letter is saying that these special actions are taking place in the 'bathing installation.' Just so there is no misunderstanding as what these words mean, they are the only ones in this lengthy two page memo which are underlined."

In the document which Zimmerman knows (through Pressac), the expression "*Badeanstalten für Sonderaktionen*" is underlined effectively in pen or pencil. But – even supposing that this has a sinister significance – how does Zimmerman know that this word had been underlined by the Germans and not by the Poles who had this in their hands for a whole decade? Our naive professor ignores that in the Moscow archives there exists another version of this document (signed regularly and with the same handwritten annotation in the left margin), in which, however, the term in question is *not* underlined.[190] Another example of Zimmerman diletantism!

20. While commenting on the "*Fernschreiben*" (telex) by Bischoff of

December 18, 1942, in which a “special action” by the Gestapo in regard to civilian workers is mentioned, Zimmerman considers Pressac’s[\[191\]](#) interpretation possible, but adds:

“It is quite possible that the camp administration sought to make an example of some of the civilian workers by executing them. This could explain why the memo is marked ‘secret’”

The original text states there was a “special action by the Gestapo of all civilian workers,” that is *all*, not *some*. If the Zimmerman interpretation is correct, the Gestapo executed *all* civilian workers. In December 1942 the civil workers that worked to Auschwitz were more of 900.[\[192\]](#) But what does one expect from an alleged Holocaust expert who doesn’t know German? The fact that the document bears the term “secret” doesn’t matter. For example, that term does not appear at all on the letter by Bischoff of January 29, 1943, which would have been much more compromising in that it displays the term “gassing cellar.”

21. Zimmerman offers another example of his technical as well as his historical-documentary ignorance when he writes:

“The estimated capacity of cremation ovens for Mogilew was 3000 per day.”

Our naive professor ignores that of the 4 Topf 8-muffled ovens originally ordered by the SS Main Office Budget and Construction, Mogilew was restricted to only half of one 8-muffled oven, which therefore amounted to 4 muffles.

And assuming the absurd cremation capacity shown in a letter by the Central Construction Office of June 28, 1943, to be correct, those 4 muffles would have been able to cremate 384 corpses in 24 hours! And also if the 3,000 cremated mentioned above were not one of the many Zimmerman falsifications but rather a blunder by his source, then Zimmerman would still be guilty of a total lack of critical sense, because he reports this foolish lie as if it were the truth.

4. Zimmerman’s Technical Incompetence

22. To “refute” my arguments regarding duration of the cremation processes in the coke-fueled ovens at Auschwitz, Zimmerman shares a document note relating to cremations carried out in the crematory at Gusen from September 26 to November 12, 1941, however, due to his utter

ignorance of thermotechnology, it is not surprising that he has not understood anything. First of all, the first column of the document bears the inscription “Uhr” “hour,” but nowhere is it specified to what this “Uhr” corresponds. However Professor Zimmerman authoritatively decides that the data contained in this column is to refer to the time of cremation. This is not merely an unauthorized interpretation, it is also technically absurd, because if that were the case, the oven would have been able to cremate one corpse in 8 (eight) minutes with a grill speed^[193] of 343 kg/hr, while the maximum speed (with an artificial maximum draft of 30 mm water column) was 90 kg/hr. Eight minutes would be absurdly short even for our professor.

With this artifice, founded on one day of cremations (that of November 7, 1941),^[194] Zimmerman declares that “each oven could incinerate a body in 25.2 minutes,” which is both unfounded by documents and technically absurd.

23. Zimmerman writes moreover:

“Kurt Prüfer, the Topf engineer who built the 46 Birkenau ovens, ^[195] stated in a letter on November 15, 1942 that the ovens be installed in the Buchenwald concentration camp had a one-third greater output than had previously been thought.”

The source of this is the Pressac book, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*. Professor Zimmerman continues:

“Unfortunately, he does not say what number the one third is greater than. However, on the same day he informed the Bauleitung that five triple-muffle furnaces, 15 ovens, could incinerate 800 corpses in 24 hours.”

The source is another writing by Pressac, *The Machinery of Mass Murder at Auschwitz*, in which that French historian wrote:^[196]

“Extrapolating the Buchenwald data for Auschwitz, Prüfer concluded that the five furnaces of the new crematorium in Birkenau could incinerate 800 corpses in 24 hours.”

Pressac’s archival reference is identical to that of the letter of November 15, 1941, mentioned above: “[Staatsarchiv] Weimar, 2/555a, letter Prüfer November 15, 1942.”^[197]

So Zimmerman once again has cited the same document twice as though there were two different documents! Considering his crass documentary ignorance, I do not believe that this is attributable to bad faith. Zimmerman is limited to only inventing the letter’s addressee (Prüfer “informed the Bauleitung”). The alleged Prüfer “conclusion” (“Prüfer concluded...”) is a

simple invention by Pressac, because the letter in question, in which he himself has published the original text and the transcription,[\[198\]](#) does not mention any numerical figure.

24. In that letter, the phrase, which stirred up the imagination of both Pressac and Zimmerman, is: “The furnaces perform 1/3 better than I had foreseen.” Now, both Pressac and Zimmerman arbitrarily interpret this in the sense of production/yield/capacity – that is, the number of cremated corpses per time, but it can also be interpreted in the sense of “efficiency,” which is the coke consumption per corpse. The way I understand it, I interpret the German term “leisten” precisely in the sense of efficiency. Zimmerman pretends to refute the thermotechnical reasoning for this reduction of the coke consumption originally expected by Prüfer,[\[199\]](#) but instead neither Pressac nor Zimmerman have explained why this term in question should refer to the capacity of the ovens. The Pressac fabrication indicated above has an essential importance to the Zimmerman pseudo-demonstrative display to which he also returns later.

25. Zimmerman affirms:

“Contrary to Legacé and Leuchter, it is known that the Topf ovens could work on a continuous daily basis.”

This is supposed to have been demonstrated by the Topf letter of July 14, 1941, mentioned above. However this actually refers to a forced functioning of an oven, which certainly could have functioned continuously for even more than 24 hours, but which, in this manner, would have progressively lost its efficiency until finally it would have stopped functioning altogether if slag had not been removed from the oven grills, which restricts the flow of required combustion air. Even the expert Pole Roman Dawidowski, in his calculation of a technically absurd cremation capacity, admitted during the Höss trial:[\[200\]](#)

“A continuous functioning in two shifts of 12 hours per day, considering 3 hours pause per day for the extraction of slag from the gas generators and for various minor work, with the inevitable interruptions of continuous activity.”

Pressac also admits a 3 hour pause in continuous activity. This affirmation also appears in the article *The Machinery of Mass Murder at Auschwitz*,[\[201\]](#) but Zimmerman prefers to ignore this. Therefore Lagacé and Leuchter are in excellent company!

26. Zimmerman works himself up, attempting to demonstrate with a series

of illogical arguments that the cremation capacity of the crematories of Auschwitz were excessive for only the natural mortality of the prisoners, and that this demonstrates that they were planned and built for a criminal purpose; for mass extermination.

I shall spare the reader of this article the refutation of Zimmerman's technical foolishness, and shall limit this to mentioning one single document. This concerns a letter of the head of the Central Construction Office dated July 10, 1942, from which results that a crematorium of type II/III with 15 muffle was projected for 30,000 prisoners, whereby the muffle-prisoner ratio was 1:2,000. Thus the 46 muffles of Birkenau were projected for 92,000 prisoners, but according to the final plans of the SS, the Birkenau camp was supposed to contain 140,000 prisoners, and 70 muffles were supposed to have been requested. In practice, the number of muffles at Birkenau was really inadequate in regards to the projected expansion of the camp![\[202\]](#)

27. Zimmerman wrote one entire paragraph to the problem of "Durability of the Ovens." He, among others, pretends to demonstrate that the Auschwitz ovens could have carried out without any damage an enormously greater number of cremations than those I have put forward based upon the article by Engineer R. Jakobskötter, which I cite below, that is, 3,000 cremations per muffle. Zimmerman writes:

"In the late 1880s, two ovens were installed in a crematory in Southern Paris. These ovens were designed to cremate 5000 bodies per year or 2500 per furnace."

This is confirmation of the validity of my argument. Zimmerman refers to the Toisul and Fradet oven installed in the Paris cemetery by Père Lachaise in 1889. It consisted of a gigantic three-floor structure: on the ground floor was the provision for the recuperator; on the first floor the cremation chamber; and in the basement the gas generator. It was a single oven with a single cremation chamber.[\[203\]](#)

28. Zimmerman continuous:

"Augustus Cobb, a leading cremation expert of the period, learned from the engineer who worked in the crematory that '(a)lthough nearly four hundred bodies are burned in these furnaces every month, a close inspection of their walls showed no traces of fissures, and the same remark applies to the walls of the furnaces in the crematory in Milan (in Italy)."

The figure put forward by Zimmerman (400 corpses per month) is false.

In the first five years of activity, in the Toisul and Fradet oven mentioned above, there were cremated: 49 corpses in 1889; 121 in 1890; 134 in 1891; 159 in 1892; and 189 in 1893. This is a total of 652 in five years[204] and an average of 10 to 11 per month!

At the end of the 1920s, when the number of crematories in France increased and the practice of cremation was more widespread throughout the country, there were 877 cremations during 1926; 861 in 1927; 945 in 1928; and 1,118 in 1929.[205] In Germany, where cremation was more widespread, there were a total of 881 corpses cremated from 1889 to 1893,[206] averaging approximately 15 per month!

As for the crematory of Milan (Italy), 304 cremations occurred from 1874 to June 30, 1884, averaging approximately 3 per month![207]

I don't know if the deception is from Zimmerman or from his sources; but that's of little importance: the topic is absolutely bogus.

29. Professor Zimmerman continues like this:

“Additional information on these ovens published in 1893 shows that from 1889 to 1892, 11,852 were cremated in these facilities.”

This is yet another deception. As I related above, during the period indicated by Zimmerman, there were a total of 652 corpses cremated in the Père Lachaise oven. Therefore the bogus figure put forward by Zimmerman is 18 times more than the real one.

In all of Germany, which was the European country where the practice of cremation was most widespread, there were a total of 881 corpses cremated from 1889 to 1893. The figure of 11,000 in one year was exceeded only in the year 1916 with 49 crematories!⁵⁰

30. Zimmerman triumphantly concludes:

“As will be seen, Germany led Europe in cremation technology in the 1930s. It would appear logical to conclude that Germany of the 1940s had more durable ovens than France of 50 years earlier.”

The bad faith of Zimmerman is quite evident because the article I quoted is from 1941! Rudolf Jakobskötter, by profession “*Stadtoberingenieur*” (chief engineer of the city), was a cremation professional and an authoritative and reliable source (different from the popularized citations spread by Zimmerman). In that article, Jakobskötter relates:[208]

“Since more than 3000 cremations were performed in the second electrical oven at Erfurt, while so far muffles withstood only 2000 cremations, depending on their design, one can claim that the design

regarding the durability has been affirmed. The construction firm is counting on a life span of 4000 cremations per muffle in future.”

Therefore in October of 1941, German technology, which was in the leading position throughout the world in the field of cremation, had not yet developed fire-resistant muffle walls that could withstand 4,000 cremations.

Zimmerman claims to refute this factual data from 1941 with false data from 1893! Another shining example of his utter bad faith.

From 1941 until today progress has not been exceptional in this area. Here is what the American firm “Industrial Equipment & Engineering Co.” writes in their description of its electrically heated “Ener-Tek II” crematory oven: [\[209\]](#)

“The refractory and insulating materials used in the construction of the Ener-Tek II are of a very high quality, which will ensure many thousands of cremations before repair of the brick work is required.”

Here it still refers to “many thousand,” not to “tens of thousands,” as would have been necessary at Auschwitz if the ovens had also cremated the corpses of the “gassed.” Documentation concerning the “Ener-Tek II” oven comprising various technical designs was published by Fred Leuchter in his report, which Zimmerman well knows, but he prefers to ignore this data which contradicts his baseless conjectures.

31. To “refute” my argument concerning the durability of the refractory walls in the Topf 2-muffled oven at Gusen after scarcely 3,200 cremations (1,600 per muffle), Zimmerman claims that “it is possible that the Gusen ovens may not have originally been built correctly.” An unfounded hypothesis which is based upon a simple analogy:

“Topf admitted that Krema IV ovens were made defectively.”

But that is false. “Topf” did never make an “admission” of this sort. Zimmerman furnishes in this regard the erroneous reference to a “Topf letter of April 4, 1943 to the Bauleitung in APMO, BW 30/34 p. 43” (note 88), while in reality this deals with a letter of April 10, in which “Topf” does not even believe that the 8-muffle oven of Crematory IV had actually been damaged (“the cracks to have allegedly occurred recently.”)[\[210\]](#)

32. To my affirmations that the Central Construction Office documents do not in the least attest to four complete replacements of the refractory walls of all the muffles of all the Auschwitz ovens, which would have been necessary if there was also corpse cremation of alleged “gassed,” Zimmerman objects:

“In fact, no information has surfaced from these archives, or any other

archives, that even one cremation took place in Auschwitz. In other words, not one contemporaneous document has surfaced from any source showing that even one cremation took place in Auschwitz.”

And he concludes:

“According to Mattogno’s logic, this must mean that no cremation took place at Auschwitz!”

To begin with, the Zimmerman affirmation is false. Those who have such documentary ignorance should refrain from affirming things categorically. There in fact exists a *“Kontrollzettel für die Firma J.A. Topf & Söhne, Erfurt”* concerning the first crematory oven at Auschwitz in which one reads:[\[211\]](#)

“The test incineration of the first corpses was performed the same day.”

As to the rest, Zimmerman evidently ignores that the Moscow archival documents enable the reconstruction of the complete picture of the Topf Company commissions and invoice controls, among others. This picture categorically excludes that Topf had ever replaced the refractory walls of the Birkenau ovens. For the ovens of the Auschwitz main camp, one single replacement was probably carried out.

The fact that in this documentation only one reference to a cremation can be found (in order to verify the efficiency of a cremation oven) is simply due to the fact that the Central Construction Office was only responsible for the construction and maintenance of the crematories, whereas their operation was the responsibility of the Political Department.

33. Nevertheless, when he takes it easy, Zimmerman insolently and opportunistically resumes my arguments against me, by adapting to the Gusen case:

“If these overhauls had taken place, they would have certainly been detailed in this file because the information on the 1941 overhaul includes all correspondence with Topf on materials used, billing information and time sheets for the days and hours worked, including overtime.”

Thus Zimmerman knows very well, but feigns not to understand, that the same thing is valid for Auschwitz as well! It is true that for 1941 the correspondence between the Topf company and the SS New Construction Office (later Construction Office) of Mauthausen is nearly complete, but one can not say the same thing for sure for the following years. As to 1941, after the replacement of the refractory walls of the Gusen oven, it cremated at the maximum approximately 1,900 corpses,[\[212\]](#) therefore the oven could

cremate another 4,100, that is to say 6,000 in all or 3,000 in each muffle. Because the documentation is fragmentary, one cannot affirm nor exclude anything for the subsequent years.

34. Still, Zimmerman objects that

“from 1940 through April 1945 there were 27,556 cremations in Mauthausen. Yet, Mattogno was arguing that all 52 Auschwitz ovens could not have disposed of more than 162,000 bodies.”

Let us assume that this figure is exact (it is said to result from a list of cremations conserved at Arolsen, which no one has ever seen), then the comparison just does not make any sense. The first crematory oven at Mauthausen was installed by the Kori Company, about which no correspondence exist. Therefore, for all we know, the Kori Company could have replaced the oven refractory walls ten times.

The Topf two-muffled oven was not installed “in July 1944,” as Zimmerman pretends, but during January-February of 1945. The Topf-Mauthausen correspondence, which Zimmerman knows well, contains a letter from Topf to the Mauthausen Construction Office dated December 20, 1944, in which Topf advises to quickly begin the work for the oven foundation and for the smoke conduit, and a letter dated January 3, 1945, in which Topf gives advance notice of dispatching head engineer Schultze for January 9,[\[213\]](#) therefore the oven was constructed then. But we must understand: our “Holocaust expert” doesn’t know German!

35. And to “demonstrate” the reality of multiple crematories at Auschwitz, our Professor Zimmerman can’t find anything better to cite than a deposition concerning Dachau (!) according to which[\[214\]](#)

“an oven could burn 7 to 9 bodies in two hours when they were all introduced simultaneously.”

This claim is simply too foolish to merit a response. For a scientific discussion of multiple cremations at Auschwitz, I return for now to the last updated version of my article on cremations at Auschwitz.[\[215\]](#)

36. Now we come to Zimmerman’s awkward attempt to “refute” my thermal balance calculations of the Birkenau ovens. The point of departure for the calculation of coke consumption is the effective consumption of the Gusen oven for 677 cremations (October 31 to November 12), that is, an approximate average of 30.6 kg of coke per corpse.

Zimmerman states that from September 26 to October 15, 203 corpses were cremated in the same oven (in reality there were 193) with a

consumption of 153 wheelbarrows of coke, which amounts to 9,180 kg of coke, or in average 45 kg per corpse (in reality 47.5). In the column “Karren Koks” of the cremation lists at Gusen, it clearly states: “1 K.= 60 kg,” which allows the transformation of wheelbarrows into kg.

The difference in consumption results from the fact that during the period of September 26 to October 15 cremations were less frequent. On September 27, 28, and 30, and October 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 12 there were *no* cremations at all, so the oven cooled-down. During the remaining days the average daily number of cremations was very low – hardly 19 – amounting to approximately 9 to 10 per muffle. However, from October 31 to November 12 cremations occurred every day for a daily average of 52, which averaged 26 per muffle.

A cold oven consumes considerable calories in its refractory walls in order to reach operational temperature. Therefore, when the frequency of cremations is low, the consumption of fuel per corpse is higher. For example, the 8 consecutive cremations carried out by Engineer R. Kessler on January 5, 1927, in the Dessau crematory (regarding which he published very detailed diagrams of the cremation process and of coke consumption) required on the average 54.5 kg of coke per cremation, of which, however, a good 25 were debited to heating up the oven. (The consumption of coke was 200 kg of coke for pre-heating of the oven, and 236 kg for the 8 cremations). If the oven had already been hot, the coke consumption would have been 29.5 kg for each corpse.

Professor Zimmerman, who does not even possess this elementary knowledge, draws an arbitrary and unfounded conclusion from that fact:

“There is some reason, however, to suspect that each wheelbarrow did not contain 60 kilograms of coke but that this was a generic number based on the theoretical maximum that each delivery could hold.”

There is, however, no reason to assume that this “generic” quantity had to be “the theoretical maximum” instead of an average. And even if this were true, the wheelbarrows during that period of October 31 to November 12 would have contained only the $(30.5 \div 47.5 \times 100 =)$ 64% of the coke contained in the wheelbarrows of the period from September 26 to October 15, but this is definitely a senseless supposition.

On the other hand, the head of the Gusen crematory was drafting the reports concerning “*Brennstoffverbrauch*” (fuel consumption) in kilograms, and in one of these documents, the coke consumption from September 26 to

October 15 is indicated as being exactly 9,180 kg,[\[216\]](#) which signifies that one wheelbarrow of coke corresponded to an average of 60 kg. And with this, all of Zimmerman's suppositions collapse.

37. Zimmerman objects that

“the practice of multiple cremation was known outside of Germany well before World War II. In Osaka, Japan in the 1880s there were 20 cremation ovens, each of which could incinerate three bodies simultaneously in a period of four hours.”

I point out first of all that the average duration for the cremation of one corpse here is 80 minutes per corpse, and *not* 25 minutes or less. Here Zimmerman offers another sample of his incompetence. By completely ignoring cremation history and crematory installations, our professor cannot know that there existed collective ovens, which could cremate several corpses simultaneously indeed, but which had a completely different design than those at Auschwitz. Any comparison in this regard is therefore meaningless.

5. Zimmerman's Methodical Errors

38. Zimmerman dedicates a sprawling two-page paragraph to the question of the “Necessity of the Crematoria.” He claims:

“The only way to test the necessity is to compare it to deaths in other concentration camps and the cremation capacity of those camps”

Zimmerman thereupon makes a comparison between the ovens of Mauthausen-Gusen and those of Auschwitz and concludes that the crematories of Auschwitz had an excessive cremation capacity for prisoners deceased from natural causes.

However, if he had made his comparison with the crematory of Buchenwald, he would have arrived at the opposite conclusion. The two Topf triple-muffle ovens of that crematory went into operation during the second half of August and the beginning of December 1942. From May 3 to November 29, 1942, 1,691 prisoners died at Buchenwald, averaging approximately 241 per month, with a maximum point of 335 (August 3 to 30). The average population of the camp was approximately 8,660 prisoners, with a maximum of 9,777 (November 2 to 29).[\[217\]](#) Making the same calculations as Zimmerman did (based upon data of 26 cremations per muffle and day), the ovens would have been able to cremate ($26 \times 6 \times 30 =$) 4,680 corpses per month, which is almost 14 times more than the maximum

mortality actually registered!

Yet in the case of Auschwitz – still following Zimmerman’s reasoning – the cremation capacity would have been $(30,000 \div 9,000 =)$ approximately three times greater than the maximum mortality.

So for a camp, which was *not* for extermination, the German authorities “anticipated” a mortality rate 14 times higher than the actual maximum, but for a camp which alleged *was* for extermination, the German authorities “anticipated” a mortality rate merely three times higher than the actual maximum!

39. Contesting the alleged “Typhus Myth,” Zimmerman objects that “only 2,060 of the 68,864 deaths were from typhus,” claiming that the cause of death appearing on the “death certificates” was very often falsified by the SS, and Professor Zimmerman concludes:

“How then can they be explained if the stated causes do not conform to physical reality? The only explanation is that camp authorities were engaged in a massive killing campaign of registered prisoners.”

Well, two facts are incontestable: that at the beginning of July 1942 a typhus epidemic broke out in Auschwitz, and during that month the mortality of the prisoners increased enormously. Now if Professor Zimmerman doesn’t want to see a cause and effect connection between these two facts, that’s his business. Of course it’s true that some survived the typhus epidemics, such as Lucie Adelsberger and Ella Lingens Reiner, but it’s equally true that the poor inmates who were not “prominent” – even if they survived *that* sickness – because of the general prostration of their physical condition, the weakening of their immune system, and because of the scarcity of medicine, they could easily incur other ailments and die from other causes. In my opinion this explains the relatively small number of deaths from typhus in the *Sterbebücher* (death books) of Auschwitz.[\[218\]](#)

Regarding babies that “were said to have died from ‘decrepitude’,” it is difficult to believe that doctors were falsifying in this idiotic way. Grotum and Parcer, Zimmerman’s sources, indicated one single case of this kind, [\[219\]](#) even by making a computerized analysis of the data contained in the *Sterbebücher*. It is reasonable to assume that this one is the only one.[\[220\]](#) This is therefore most likely an ordinary error.

40. One last observation concerning the connection between the deceased and the coke supplies to the crematories. Zimmerman writes in conclusion of his analysis of the problem:

“Therefore, the month of the second-highest recorded coke delivery also corresponds with the month of either the lowest or one of the lowest monthly death totals of registered prisoners.”

This fact, which Zimmerman considers to be an implacable contradiction, is nevertheless perfectly normal, as I explained in point 36. Few cremations signify major cooling of the oven and major consumption of fuel for maintaining operating temperature. Many cremations signify instead minor cooling down of the oven.

II. The End of John C. Zimmerman

1. Introduction

Zimmerman's article "Body Disposal at Auschwitz: The End of the Holocaust Denial" was all too clearly an ideological attack against revisionism without any historical or technical foundation, which is why I limited my initial refutation to the essential points reproduced above. But Prof. Zimmerman, who is clearly out to prove a predefined image, probably in league with the so-called "Holocaust History Project," immediately responded with another even more arrogant and senseless article: "My Answers to Carlo Mattogno." This required a radical refutation of Zimmerman's lies, which is accomplished by the following article. Not knowing how to counter my arguments, Prof. Zimmerman disappeared entirely from the stage after this rebuttal as I indicated above. My refutation did not only upset Zimmerman, but also the ranks of his fans, who, after several years of pondering, established a kind of "Aid Committee" with the purpose to rehabilitate Zimmerman by discrediting me with further lies. I have addressed their assault in another study, which complements the observations made here.[\[221\]](#)

2. Zimmerman's "Errors"

In my response, I immediately exposed the absurdity of the claim of this professor who poses as a specialist in the correct interpretation of German documents but doesn't even understand the German language. In addition I have revealed his ignorance of historical and technical matters as well as his bad faith which I have documented with many examples. Our professor has received the blow and has been exposed as a blatant liar and has been constrained to admit his "errors" in his "My Response":

1. His "error" regarding the date of Bischoff's letter of January 13, 1943, to which he ascribed the date June 13 (point 11 of my "Observations"). Zimmerman's excuse is that he had at his disposal "a copy of the original German document," he reported the date appearing in the English translation published by the NMT, so that he "never cross checked the

date from the translation. A careless error, to be sure, but an honest one.” That is how he provides another proof of his superficiality and dilettantism.

2. His “error” regarding the furnace at Mauthausen, which was constructed in January 1945 (point 45): “Relying on a *secondary source*, I gave the date of July 1944.” And this is just what I reproached him for: using secondary sources.
3. His “error” regarding the letter of Topf dated July 14, 1941 (point15):
“*In citing a report by Topf engineers dated July 14, 1941 describing the efficiency of an oven as being able to burn 10 to 35 bodies in ten hours, I believed that it was a different report than the one Pressac cited from the same day which talks about burning 30 to 36 bodies in 10 hours.*”

One more proof of the superficiality and dilettantism of our professor, as well as proof of his rash tendency to refer to secondary sources.

4. His “error” regarding the “testimony” of M. Morawa. To tell the truth, Zimmerman is reluctant to admit this “error,” and the reason is easy to understand: his inability to interpret even the sources reported by D. Czech in her *Kalendarium*²⁴ is truly the peak of his dilettantism! Zimmerman justifies himself as follows:

“*I have not been able to ascertain whether this was Morawa based on information I received from Auschwitz State Museum.*”

So Zimmerman would want us to believe that not even the Auschwitz Museum succeeded in resolving this tremendous “enigma”! Now, according to the Auschwitz Museum, Morawa was shot dead at Mauthausen on April 3, 1945.[\[222\]](#) When and to whom did he give this phantom “testimony”?

Danuta Czech, in her *Kalendarium*, reports the reference: “APMO, D-Mau-3a/16408, Häftlings-Personal-Karte von Mieczyslaw Morawa.”[\[223\]](#) Therefore our professor takes a “Häftlings-Personal-Karte” (inmate personnel card) for a “testimony”! Another brilliant example of his crass ignorance and dilettantism.

5. His “error” regarding the mix-up of the year 1814 with 1871.
5. His “error” regarding the 4 barracks of Birkenau.
7. His “error” regarding the complete destruction of so-called *Bunker 2*, without leaving any trace, from which it emerges that our “expert” on Auschwitz has never visited the camp!

3. His “error” regarding Zimmerman’s attribution of Pressac’s simple *calculation* to Kurt Prüfer! This shows once more that Zimmerman does not even comprehend his own sources!

9. His “error” regarding the *Aktenvermerk* of June 16, 1944:

“I thought that the reference to BA I and II was to Birkenau Kremas I and II, known in most literature as Krema II and III.”

Therefore, our “expert” on Auschwitz has confused *Bauabschnitte*, construction sectors in the Birkenau camp, with the crematoria! Yet another example of his astonishing ignorance!

0. Besides, Zimmerman has made another “error” in asserting that “Mattogno never addressed the issue of open air burnings.”

1. Another “error” admitted by Zimmerman relates to his travesty of what I wrote on the so-called *Bunker* of Birkenau:

“Mattogno correctly states in this regard that in the full quotation he specifically uses the word ‘designation’ when referring to these structures.”

This list is far from complete. He is prudently silent on other obvious “errors.” For example, he is silent on the translation regarding the flames of the triple-muffle oven which went “round the two side muffles.” He reported this absurdity without the least comment, showing that he does not have the faintest idea of how these triple-muffle ovens worked – and not only these.

He says nothing of the “errors” concerning the “gasoline” of Frölich (point 7 of my “Observations”), or the “kerosene” of Erichsen (point 8), nor of the interpretative error concerning an emphasis in the only version of the file memo of August 21, 1942, which he knows (point 19). Zimmerman nevertheless admits:

“in the “Body Disposal” study I made some errors to be discussed later on, on several occasions relied on inaccurate sources – in one case very badly (in one case resulting in a significant error).”

Perhaps with these admissions Zimmerman wants to give the impression that he is an unbiased researcher who can recognize his own mistakes, but the fact remains that he has been compelled to this by the force of my arguments. How true this is can be seen from the fact that he has not admitted his most serious “error,” which I did not point out in my “Observations” because at the time I did not yet have access to the source he cited.

Zimmerman writes in “Body Disposal”:

“Kurt Prüfer, builder of the ovens, was asked why the brick linings of

the ovens were damaged so quickly. He replied that the damage resulting after six months was ‘because the strain on the furnaces was enormous.’ He recounted how he had told Topf’s chief engineer in charge of crematoria, Fritz Sanders [sic], about the strain on the furnaces of so many corpses waiting to be incinerated as a result of the gassing. Sanders stated that he had been told by Prüfer and another Topf engineer that the ‘capacity of the furnaces was so great because three (gassed) corpses were incinerated (in one oven) simultaneously.’”

He adds in a footnote:

“Prufer said that two bodies were simultaneously incinerated in his presence.”

The reference is to the interrogations of the Topf engineers on the part of a Soviet inquiry of SMERSH between 1946 and 1948. An excerpt was published by Gerald Fleming,[\[224\]](#) from which Zimmerman takes his citations (notes 121f.).

In reality Kurt Prüfer – according to Fleming – had stated the very *opposite* of what Zimmerman attributed to him by means of a despicable manipulation. On page 200 of the cited work, this is how Fleming summarizes part of the interrogation which K. Prüfer underwent on March 5, 1946[\[225\]](#):

“Normal crematoria^[226] work with prewarmed air^[227] so that the corpse burns quickly and without smoke. As the crematoria in the concentration camps were constructed differently, this procedure could not be used.^[228] The corpses burned more slowly and created more smoke, necessitating ventilation.^[229]”

Question: How many corpses were incinerated in Auschwitz per hour?

Answer: In a crematorium with five furnaces and fifteen muffles, fifteen corpses were burned.” (my emphasis)

During the interrogation of March 19, K. Prüfer declared:[\[230\]](#)

“I spoke about the enormous strain on the overused furnaces. I told Chief Engineer Sander: I am worried whether the furnaces can stand the excessive usage. In my presence two corpses were pushed into one muffle instead of one corpse. The furnaces could not stand the strain.” (my emphasis)

Recapitulating, Kurt Prüfer stated that:

- l. The cremations in the concentration camp ovens took place “more slowly” than in civilian ovens.

2. In Krema II and Krema III of Birkenau (5 three-muffle ovens) it was possible to cremate 15 corpses in one hour, that is, the duration of a single cremation was one hour.
3. The attempt to simultaneously cremate two corpses failed because “the furnaces could not stand the strain.”

These three statements alone constitute a radical refutation of Zimmerman’s thermotechnical fantasies. I summarize and conclude that:

1. in order to prove the thesis of “multiple” cremations, Zimmerman quotes a second-hand declaration of Prüfer and omits the primary declaration of Prüfer himself.
2. For the same motive, Zimmerman quotes Prüfer’s statement in which he “said that two bodies were simultaneously incinerated in his presence,” but omits the statement which follows: “The furnaces could not stand the strain.”

These surgical omissions are unequivocal proof of Zimmerman’s complete and deliberate deceptiveness.

I later found out that Fleming’s translation (“enormous strain,” “the furnaces could not stand the strain”) is wrong, too. Particularly the sentence “pječi nje spravljali s toi nagruzkoi” does not mean “the furnaces could not stand the strain” but “did not cope with that load,” that is to say, to the load of two to three corpses inserted into one muffle; “nagruzka” designates in fact the “load” of the oven. Prüfer therefore meant that the ovens did not succeed to cremate such a load in an economically advantageous manner if compared to a load of merely a single body per muffle.[\[231\]](#) This does, of course, not alter the fact of Zimmerman’s own manipulations.

3. “Terminologies”

Pointing out in my “Observations” that in “Body Disposal” Zimmerman always talks of the *Bauleitung* of Auschwitz, I wrote that he:

“has no idea of the fact that the Bauleitung (Construction Office) was promoted to Zentralbauleitung (Central Construction Office) on November 14, 1941”

Zimmerman objects that I myself used the term “Bauleitung” in 1996 concluding:

“Apparently, Mattogno believes that he is exempt from having to use correct terminology.”

In 1998 I published the book *La “Zentralbauleitung der Waffen-SS und Polizei Auschwitz,”* [232] which is the most profound study that exists on this most important Auschwitz office. Since 1998 I obviously no longer make the blunder of using the terms *Bauleitung* and *Zentralbauleitung*, which Zimmerman by contrast continues to use. Surprising, is it not, that he persists in his pathetic attempt to refute my writings on Auschwitz but ignores one of my important studies on the subject! And it is precisely this ignorance that I wanted to emphasize in the above way.

Not only this, but – as we will see below – Zimmerman cites a passage from a work published in 1996 by the Auschwitz Museum, in which it is clearly stated that already in July 1942 the Construction Office of Auschwitz had been promoted to the rank of Central Construction Office, and he is still ignorant of the difference between the two terms, paying not the slightest attention to them and continuing his blunder to speak of the Construction Office, evidently because he feels himself “exempt from having to use correct terminology.”

4. “Lack of Documentation”

The documentation of the Central Construction Office kept in Moscow no doubt has some gaps. The problem is, to whom are these gaps due? Zimmerman maintains that:

“the lack to date of any such information is more incriminating than all of the evidence that does exist on Auschwitz.”

This presupposes that the gaps are due to the SS of Auschwitz, which is precisely what needs to be proved. Zimmerman claims that:

“all documents relating to crematoria construction were under a blanket order of secrecy going back to June 1942.”

He repeats that again when writing:

“there was a blanket order of secrecy on building projects dating from at least June 1942.”

Therefore, all the documentation relating to the crematoria were “*geheime Sache*” (secret matters) or “*geheime Reichssache*” (state secrets) as the SS put it. But why then did the SS not destroy the entire archive of the Central Construction Office, which contains thousands of “secret” documents on the crematoria?

Jean-Claude Pressac was the first to look into this question. He formulated

the following hypothesis:[\[233\]](#)

“The reason for leaving behind [the archives] as they were can perhaps be found in the personality of the SS lieutenant Werner Jothann, who was the second – and last – director of the Auschwitz [Zentral]bauleitung. This architectural engineer had not personally been involved in the homicidal revamping of the crematoria at the end of 1942 and in early 1943 under the first director, SS captain Karl Bischoff. Unaware of the ‘explosive’ character of the files concerning those changes, Jothann left without worrying about them and did not order them to be destroyed.”

Later, Robert Jan van Pelt returned to this topic with an argument of a disconcerting banality:[\[234\]](#)

“When the Germans burned the archives of the camp Kommandantur prior to their evacuation from Auschwitz in January 1945, they overlooked [!] the archive of the building office that had been closed some months earlier, and as a result the material in this archive was found more or less intact.”

SS-Obersturmführer Jothann succeeded SS-Obersturmbannführer Karl Bischoff as head of the Central Construction Office on October 1, 1943, when the crematoria of Birkenau were supposedly carrying out exterminations at full throttle. Therefore, even if he had not come to know the allegedly “explosive character of the files,” he could not have ignored the alleged reality of the mass exterminations that went on in buildings, for which he was now directly responsible. He actually knew the contents of those files perfectly well, because in the transfer document signed by him together with Bischoff on January 5, 1944, there is a list of all buildings, for which he was now responsible, including crematoria II and III with their respective documentation.[\[235\]](#)

As for Bischoff, he had become head of the Construction Inspection of the Waffen-SS and Police Silesia, which was in direct control of the Auschwitz Central Construction Office. He therefore remained Jothann’s immediate superior in the hierarchy of the SS-WVHA. Bischoff himself could not possibly ignore the “explosive character of the files,” and one telephone call from him would have been enough to get Jothann to destroy them. But things are quite different.

The files of an SS office were not the personal property of its director. They belonged to the State, and therefore only the SS-WVHA could decide

on the fate of the various archives. As results from numerous files kept in the Archives of Military History in Prague, documents classified as “geheime Sache” (secret) and “geheime Reichssache” (top secret), belonging to *Einsatzgruppe VII* of *Organisation Todt* were destroyed at the end of January 1945 by order from above, and a “*Vernichtungsprotokoll*” (record of destruction) listing all the documents destroyed was drawn up.[\[236\]](#)

At Auschwitz, the destruction order for the archive of Central Construction Office had to come from the head of Office Group C of SS-WVHA, who had approved all camp projects, including the one on the alleged “homicidal revamping of the crematoria.”

But in that case, as Zimmerman asserts, the files would have been classified “top secret” and the head of Office Group C of SS-WVHA would have ordered their destruction. Instead, they were neither destroyed by ignorance nor by carelessness, and the obvious conclusion is that the SS authorities considered the archive of the Central Construction Office to be totally innocuous.

What is Zimmerman’s explanation?

As I demonstrated in the above-mentioned book on the Central Construction Office, the organization of this office was most complex and also decentralized. Already by the beginning of 1943 it was subdivided into 5 Construction Offices, and the Central Construction Office itself comprised 14 section (*Sachgebiete*).[\[237\]](#) Each Construction Office and each section had its own archive. What we now call “the archive of the Central Construction Office” originally constituted some tens of archives. Like all documents, those on the crematoria were drawn up in several copies (the addressees were listed under the item “*Verteiler*” = distributor). Each copy was sent to the respective office, where it was archived. For example, Bischoff’s letter of February 28, 1943, on “KGL [=POW camp]= *Krem. II und III BW 30 (elektr. Aufzüge)*” was drawn up in 6 copies and sent to “*Bauwirtschaft*,” “*Rechnungslegung*,” “*Baultg. KL*,” “*Baultg. KGL*,” “*Sachbearb.*” and “*Registr. BW 30.*”[\[238\]](#) Copies of the letter of March 29 on “*Krematorium II und III KGL, BW 30 u. 30a*,” were sent to “*Baultg. KL*,” “*Baultg. KGL*,” “*Bauwirtsch.*,” “*Rohstoffstelle*,” “*Handakte*” and “*Registr. BW 30 KGL.*”[\[239\]](#)

So these two letters alone gave rise to 14 documents, which were archived in various offices. Several thousands of pages from the Central Construction Office kept at Moscow are in the form of carbon copies of this type.

The original archive comprised many folders (“*Ordner*”), each of which held the documents relating to one or more *Bauwerke* (construction sites). For example, the “*Ordner*” no. 15 contained “7 *Zeichnungen Krema II u. III*,” apart from “*Schriftwechsel*” and “*Tagelohnzettel*.”[\[240\]](#)

Now it is certain that “secret” documentation on the crematoria exists. It contains all the designs for the crematoria and also a very rich correspondence. It is just as certain that there are evident gaps, for example all the technical designs for the ovens, the reports on the cremation tests, and the reports on the consumption of coke for 1944.

According to Zimmerman’s thesis, the SS, instead of destroying in bulk all this “secret” documentation, had spare time and patience to leaf through every “*Ordner*” relating to the crematoria – which were found in all camp archives – and pick out and destroy individual documents regarded by them as compromising while leaving the rest intact, beginning with the plans for the crematoria themselves! Finally, they would have had the crematoria blown up in order to obliterate traces of their “crimes” but at the same time they would have left alive for the Soviets about 7,000 eyewitnesses of these “crimes”! Truly watertight logic!

On the other hand, the Soviets, who had to propagate the thesis of monstrous Hitlerian exterminators of millions of people, had all the interest, time, and resources to leaf through every “*Ordner*” on the crematoria, which were found in all camp archives, and pick out individual documents useful (or detrimental) for their propaganda while leaving the rest intact, beginning with the plans of the crematoria themselves. Which of these two hypotheses is more rational?

Zimmerman continues:

“Mattoigno has begun to hint that the Soviets have suppressed the records.”

The usual falsification: I simply said that the Soviets had *selected* the documents. Perhaps for Zimmerman, by a kind of conditioned reflex, *selection* is equivalent to *suppression*: If “selected” detainees are eliminated, so are selected documents!

Playing on this falsification, Zimmerman then raises objections as follows:

“The interrogation occurred in March 1946. Engineer Kurt Prufer, who built the Auschwitz ovens, stated that the Birkenau ovens could incinerate one corpse per hour and that brick lining on the ovens was

damaged after six months because the enormous strain being placed on the ovens. Prüfer's statement directly contradicted a Soviet report on this issue."

What is more, Zimmerman confronts me with the case of the Auschwitz *Sterbebücher* (death books):

"Moreover, if the Soviets were really anxious to suppress unfavorable information, then the more likely candidate would have been the Auschwitz Death Books, [because the Books document] approximately 69,000 registered prisoners."

– while the Soviets claimed that the total number of camp deaths was 4 million. In this way he only validates my thesis, because the interrogations of the Topf engineers, the *Sterbebücher*, and the entire documentation of the Central Construction Office remained *secret* (!) until the collapse of the Soviet regime, and they would still have remained so had this not happened. Why?

Until the collapse of the Soviet regime nobody knew of the existence of such documentation. So is it just as absurd to think that the missing documents were – certainly not “suppressed” – but, on account of their importance, transferred to a place more secure than an archive, and for this reason no one knew of their existence, as was earlier the case for all the other documents?

However that may be, the fact remains that my hypothesis is at least reasonable while one can certainly not say the same thing for his.

5. Prüfer and the “Enormous Strain” on the Crematoria

Above I cited the passage of Zimmerman regarding the Soviet interrogation of Kurt Prüfer. Here I wish to look at it from another point of view. Let us read it once more:

"The interrogation occurred in March 1946. Engineer Kurt Prüfer, who built the Auschwitz ovens, stated that the Birkenau ovens could incinerate one corpse per hour and that brick lining on the ovens was damaged after six months because the enormous strain being placed on the ovens."

Zimmerman summarizes the following passage from K. Prüfer's interrogation of March 6, 1946:[\[241\]](#)

"Q.: Why was the brick lining of the muffles so quickly damaged?"

A.: The bricks were already damaged after six months because the strain on the furnaces was enormous.”

We have here another error in translation. The Russian text of the interrogation[242] does not, in fact, speak of “the brick lining of the muffles,” but of “*vnutri shamotnaja otjelka tryb krjematorjev*,” i.e. the “internal refractory lining of the tubes of the crematoria.” The term “tryba” (tube) refers to the flue that went from the muffle to the chimney (in German *Rauchkanal* or *Fuchs*) and to the smoke ducts within the chimney (in German *Zug*).

In fact, the damages in question became apparent at crematorium II very early in its operation (and not after six months). On March 25, 1943, SS-*Untersturmführer* Kirschneck wrote a file memo about a meeting at Auschwitz on March 24 and 25 of the Topf representatives Prüfer and Schultze and representatives of Central Construction Office – Kirschneck himself and probably the civilian employee Lehmann. At that time, only the damage to the three forced draft units was on the agenda:[243]

“Because the three forced draft units have not, in any way, turned out to be useful and even suffered damage on account of excessive temperatures when they were first put into full operation, they will be removed at the expense of Topf & Söhne and taken back by this company.”

Later on it was discovered, however, that the refractory lining of the chimney had cracked or was damaged, and that even whole sections (“*ganze Gewölbeteile*”) of the flues had collapsed.[244] Around the same time the refractory lining of the chimney of crematorium IV was also damaged, and Prüfer had to work out a new project for both chimneys, as results from a telegram sent by Bischoff to Topf on May 14, 1943:[245]

“Bring along calculations on heat technology and structurals of chimneys for crem[atoria] II and IV. Immediate presence of chief engineer Prüfer indispensable.”

As far as the cause of the damage is concerned, Prüfer’s explanation was not only wrong, it was the exact opposite of the truth:⁸⁸

“On the basis of the new drawings you have provided, we can see that the first project concerning the chimney did not take into account the different thermal expansion and the high temperatures that were foreseeable; this was done only now in the second project.”

On the other hand, this mistake was admitted by Prüfer himself:[246]

“On his last visit, he declared in the presence of the commander that the cause had been the stress caused by the firing of only some of the ovens, which had not been taken into account in the original project.”

The Central Construction Office agreed with this explanation and accepted that for the new chimney

“the possible stresses arising from the heating of individual ovens have been accounted for by the elasticity of the brick structure.”

The damage was therefore not due to an “enormous strain,” but was caused on the contrary by the fact that only some of the ovens had been operated.

Crematorium II (and III) had six flue ducts, five for the five crematorium ovens and one for the garbage incineration oven. The flues fed in pairs into the three ducts that made up the chimney: flues of ovens 1 and 2 fed into the duct on the left, flues of ovens 3 and 4 into the central duct, and the flues of oven 5 and of the garbage incineration oven fed into the duct on the right. Each of the three chimney ducts was linked to a forced-draft blower by means of a short vertical by-pass. At the outlet of the three vertical ducts, below the corresponding blower, a movable plate allowed to operate the chimney under natural draft by closing the vertical duct.

The direct cause of the damage to the flues was the excessive temperature of the combustion gases, whereas the “heating of individual ovens” contributed to the damage to the refractory lining of the chimney by causing high thermal stresses due to the fact that the walls of the ducts were overheated on one side but stayed cool on the other. We should underline here that this “heating of individual ovens” is decidedly at variance with the testimony of H. Tauber and Danuta Czech’s *Kalendarium*, which states that the ovens of crematorium II were not only running 24 hours a day but operated even *after* the damage mentioned had occurred! Henryk Tauber has in fact declared in this connection:[\[247\]](#)

“During the cremation of this first transport in mid-March 1943, we worked without interruption for 48 hours, but did not succeed in burning all the bodies, because in the meantime a Greek convoy that had just arrived was also gassed. [...] On average, we incinerated 2,500 corpses a day.”

I will end this item with one more observation: according to K. Prüfer and as quoted by Zimmerman, “the Birkenau ovens could incinerate one corpse per hour.” How does Zimmerman reconcile this statement with his own claim

of a duration of 25.2 minutes for a cremation at Gusen and with “15 minutes per body” at Birkenau?

6. “Falsifications” and “Suppressions”

In order not to waste too much time with this dilettante, I ignored in my “Observations” several of Zimmerman’s impostures. In his reply he returns to the same deceptions. The impudence of this individual is intolerable and deserves an adequate response.

6.1. The *Gasprüfer*

In “Body Disposal” Zimmerman wrote:

“Mattogno argued that this document^[248] was a forgery because the type of gas detector mentioned in the memo was not the one which would have been used to detect prussic acid. Auschwitz: The End of a Legend, p. 66.^[249] However, Pressac also realized that this was not the same type of gas detector which would have been used to detect prussic acid.”

“The letter only shows that Topf was ignorant as to the type of gas detector which would be needed. The real problem for Mattogno was to explain why the oven builders would know it to be necessary to have such a device for a crematorium which several weeks earlier was stated to have a ‘gassing cellar.’ Since he could not find any such explanation, he reverted to the familiar denier tactic of labeling anything which cannot be explained as a forgery” (Zimmerman’s note 76)

In “My Response” he returns to the argument affirming:

“Elsewhere he has argued – without any proof – that the Soviets had altered a document from the captured Bauleitung archives to attempt to link Zyklon B to Krema II.”

Considering Zimmerman’s crass ignorance regarding historical and technical matters, he perhaps truly believes in the existence of a *Gasprüfer* (gas testers) for hydrogen cyanide! In *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend* (pp. 119-122)^[250] I reproduced each page from the most important German engineering manual of the 1930’s, from which it emerges that the *Gasprüfer* were simple analyzers of combustion gas and so could have been used only for the crematory ovens. On p. 123,^[251] I reproduced a letter of Tesch & Stabenow, in which the “gas detector” for hydrogen cyanide was called by its true name: *Gasrestnachweisgerät*. On p. 124,^[252] I published a photograph

showing that a *Gasrestnachweisgerät* was found at Auschwitz by the Soviets; on pages 105 and 106,[\[253\]](#) I provided the precise description of its constituent elements and of the usage of a *Gasrestnachweisgerät*. Instead of accepting the strictly *documented* conclusions that the *Gasprüfer* had nothing to do with hydrogen cyanide, Zimmerman claims to prove the opposite by appealing to Pressac (“However, Pressac also realized [...]”) Here our professor gives another brilliant sample of his bad faith. In fact, Pressac wrote:[\[254\]](#)

“The detection of residual hydrocyanic gas would have been performed with a chemical method and not with the ten gas testers requested too late to be delivered on time.”

But the French historian not only did not explain what this “chemical method” was (and how the Central Construction Office came into its possession), he also did not produce any archival reference or any other evidence for it.

Hence, when it does not suit Zimmerman, he rejects the affirmations of Pressac, because they are not documented, as in the case of the Birkenau camp’s expansion to hold 200,000 detainees (“however, Pressac did not cite a source”), but when it suits him, he accepts Pressac’s assertions without any source, even when they are patently false!

Zimmerman next falsifies the significance of the letter under consideration. It is untrue when Zimmerman claims that it “shows that Topf was ignorant as to the type of gas detector which would be needed.” It only shows that Topf did not manufacture the *Gasprüfer*, and for that reason had requested them already two weeks earlier “from 5 different companies.”[\[255\]](#) This falsification tries to confirm the false thesis of the existence of *Gasprüfer* for hydrogen cyanide. If Topf, which produced combustion systems, “was ignorant as to the type of gas detector which would be needed,” it follows that there existed different types of *Gasprüfer*! This is what may be called coherence within the lie.

Once he thinks he had established with this deceit that *Gasprüfer* referred to hydrogen cyanide, Zimmerman wonders why some simple constructors of crematory ovens had to be enlightened about “gas detectors,” which were used for hydrogen cyanide, and since I was in no position to provide an answer, he claimed that I simply declared the document “a forgery.” Here Zimmerman gives another demonstration of his bad faith, deliberately misrepresenting what I wrote in the article “The ‘Gasprüfer’ of Auschwitz,”

which was published on the web on February 18, 1998.[\[256\]](#) Having placed the document in its context, I concluded with the words:[\[257\]](#)

“The historical context would therefore strengthen Robert Faurisson’s interpretation, wherein these – presumed, I might add – display devices were used for normal disinfestations of the crematorium. In support of this interpretation, it could be added that according to the general provisions of the SS camp physician, 200 detainees who were working in late February 1943 in Crematory II would have been able to resume their activity only after a disinfestation of their bodies and of their work-place, i.e., Crematory II.”

Zimmerman cites this article, but limits himself to the following sentence:

“As usual, he presented no evidence for his latest peregrination”
(“Body Disposal,” note 76)

Therefore our professor lies knowing that he lies. If I concluded that the Topf letter “has been produced by an amateurish forger, who concocted a new term ‘display devices for hydrocyanic acid residues,’”[\[258\]](#) it was certainly not because the letter created some problem. On the contrary, following the interpretation of Pressac-Zimmerman, it would have been a further confirmation of my thesis that “the term Vergasungskeller designates a disinfestation basement.”[\[259\]](#) So, if I arrived at this conclusion it was only because the relevant documents provoked historical problems so serious and so numerous that the only reasonable solution seemed to me to be this one. I explained these problems in more than one page under the paragraph heading “Problems Pressac left unresolved” (pp. 145f). Zimmerman, being incapable of resolving them, cunningly tries to make them disappear with his squalid lies. On the basis of new documents, I have gone more deeply into the question of the “Gasprüfer” (gas testers) and the “Vergasungskeller” (gassing cellar) in later articles.[\[260\]](#)

6.2. The Central Construction Office Letter of June 28, 1943

Regarding this letter Zimmerman writes:

“He also argued – again without any proof – that the Soviet suppressed the ‘correct’ version of the Bauleitung report of June 28, 1943, which states that 4,756 bodies could be incinerated in a 24 hour

period. Mattoigno theorizes that this report was corrected in a subsequent report.”

In this case, too, our professor refrains from quoting my thesis correctly. In the article “The Auschwitz Central Construction Headquarters letter dated 28 June 1942: An alternative Interpretation,”[\[261\]](#) I was interested in the origin of the letter as well as its bureaucratic significance. Pursuing this, I demonstrated by means of the documents that the letter in question is “bureaucratically senseless,” since from one point of view it lacked the one date, which constituted the reason for its existence (as appears under its “subject matter”[\[262\]](#)), that is, the communication of the *Übergabeverhandlung* (transfer negotiation) of Krema III. To contrast this, I may point out that on January 30, 1943, R. Höss asked the head of Central Construction Office for a “report on the capacity of all crematoria,” and Bischoff’s reply obviously concerned the “capacity of all crematoria” and not “completion of crematorium III.”[\[263\]](#) From another point of view, the letter of June 28, 1943, contains a date that, bureaucratically speaking, has nothing to do with the reason for the letter’s existence, that is, an indication of the cremation capacity. I repeat, the problem is purely bureaucratic and has nothing to do with the figures mentioned in the document. The problem would be there even if the numbers were ten times fewer, because it is the communication in itself of the cremation capacity, which is a bureaucratically inexplicable anomaly.

This drew me to the conclusion that the letter, which we know is an erroneous version that was subsequently substituted by a correct version, in which the *Übergabeverhandlung* (transfer negotiation) of Krema III was reported and in which the cremation capacity was *not* mentioned, as the arrangements of Kammler of April 6, 1943, prescribed.[\[264\]](#) As to the cremation capacity, I wrote that the numbers indicated in the letter are authentic, but that does mean that they are correct, and I explained the reason for this distinction. Below I will demonstrate that the numbers are technically absurd.

Instead of discussing my analysis of the document, and instead of explaining the serious bureaucratic anomalies which it presents, Zimmerman limits himself to quoting my conclusions out of context in order to make his readers believe that the correction, of which I spoke, referred to the cremation capacity.

Zimmerman’s “real problem” is that he, like all dilettantes, is incapable of

critically analyzing a document. He accepts everything blindly and opportunistically and pretends that the problems, which the document creates, do not exist. Not only that, he also has the impudence to reprove the person who discovers them, who understands their importance, and who searches to resolve them.

7. The Gusen Oven

7.1. Coke Consumption

In “Body Disposal,” Zimmerman wrote:

“The Gusen file that Mattogno relied on shows the amount of coke in the form of wheelbarrows used to transport it to the ovens. At the top of the page it states ‘Karren Koks,’ or wheelbarrows of coke. Below this heading it states that one wheelbarrow equals 60 kilograms. However, this weight is only stated for the period from September 26 to October 15, 1941. During this period, 203 bodies were cremated using 153 wheelbarrows. This means that 9,180 kilograms (60 kilograms times 153 barrows) incinerated 204 bodies at 45 kilograms per body. The 9,180 number appears on a backup page of this file where the 153 wheelbarrows are multiplied by 60 kilograms.

There is some reason, however, to suspect that each wheelbarrow did not contain 60 kilograms of coke but that this was a generic number based on the theoretical maximum that each delivery could hold. In other words, 60 kilograms was attached to each wheelbarrow regardless of actual weight.

For example, on October 3 eleven bodies were incinerated using 13 wheelbarrows. At 60 kilograms per wheelbarrow it would have taken 71 kilograms per body. However, on October 15, 33 bodies were incinerated using 16 wheelbarrows, or 29 kilograms per body.”

In my “Observations” I mentioned a report on the consumption of coke used by the Gusen oven, according to which “from Sept. 26, 1941 to Oct. 15, 1941, 9,180 kg of coke were used.”[\[265\]](#) Here “kg” are explicitly mentioned so that it is clear that the 153 “wheelbarrows of coke” consumed during this period correspond to exactly 9,180 kg, whence each “wheelbarrow” was exactly equivalent to $(9,180 \div 153 =)$ 60 kg. Therefore this demolishes Zimmerman’s hypothesis solely on *documentary* grounds.

The claim that one wheelbarrow of coke was equivalent to 60 kg only during the period September 26 to October 15 is another of Zimmerman's lies. The list of cremations for this period is a sheet of paper divided into two parts: The registrations for the period September 26 to November 3 are on the left, those for November 4 to 12 on the right. Each part is in turn subdivided into 4 columns carrying the designations "Uhr," "Datum," "Leichen," "Karren Koks 1 K. = 60 kg." The fourth column in the left-hand part of the document (like the first three) extends to November 3 and continues in the right-hand part until November 12.

Now as to the part on the left, it is clear that the designation "Karren Koks 1 K. = 60 kg" refers to the *entire* column, until November 3. By breaking up the logical sequence of the table, Zimmerman, on the other hand, claims abusively that it holds only up to October 15. And it is just as clear that these designations are valid for the right-hand part, which is a continuation of the part on the left. It is true that the fourth column of the right-hand part only has the wording "Karren Koks," but what need was there to repeat that one wheelbarrow of coke was equivalent to 60 kg? Granted for the sake of the argument that the wheelbarrows in the column on the right would be equivalent to less than 60 kg, they must nevertheless have always contained a *uniform* quantity, since the head of the crematorium had to draw up the report on coke consumption in kilograms (or in *Zentner* = 50 kg; see below). Had the 249 wheelbarrows used for the registered cremations in the right-hand part been continued, showing for example 20 kg, 35, 55, 40, 60, 25 kg of coke and so on, how would the head of the crematorium have calculated the total consumption? For the same administrative reason, had the wheelbarrows mentioned in the right-hand part of the report contained a uniform quantity less than 60 kg, there would have been an indication of the relative weight in the fourth column; for example: "Karren Koks 1 k. = 40 kg."

The hypotheses of Zimmerman are therefore unsustainable. As a confirmation of this, I offer another argument. As I demonstrated above, documentation alone assures us that for the period from September 26 to October 15 the wheelbarrows each contained exactly 60 kg of coke. During this period, 193 corpses were cremated with a consumption of 9,180 kg of coke, which corresponds to 47.5 ($=9,180 \div 193$) kg per corpse.



677 corpses
were cremated in
the period from




Fig. 25.

Ill. 1: Chart by Prof. Dr. P. Schlöpfer on coke consumption for subsequent cremations.

October 31 to November 12 with 345 “Karren” of coke. Since Zimmerman asserts that the weight of 60 kg of coke for each wheelbarrow was “the theoretical

maximum that each delivery could hold,” it follows that each wheelbarrow of coke had to weigh less than 60 kg. Nevertheless, assuming the weight of 60 kg, the coke consumption for the cremation of 677 corpses during the above-mentioned period comes to about 30.6 ($=60 \times 345 \div 677$) kg. According to Zimmerman, the consumption was still less. But then why was the average consumption of coke 47.5 kg?

In his profound ignorance of thermotechnical questions on crematory ovens heated with coke, Zimmerman is shockingly ironic about the experimental *fact* established in all the crematoria fitted with coke ovens that the coke consumption per corpse varied with the number of cremations.

For example, the chart “*Einäscherungen hintereinander*,” published by professor P. Schlöpfer in 1936[266] and compiled on the basis of practical experiments, shows a coke consumption of over 400 kg of coke for the first cremation in a cold oven, of around 200 for the second, and a little more than 100 kg for the fourth. Starting from the eighth cremation, the curve indicating the coke consumption tends to level out and at the twentieth and final cremation studied, the consumption of coke resulted in about 37.5 kg.[267] This signifies that 20 discontinuous cremations carried out on various days separated from one another would have needed over 8,000 ($=400 \times 20$) kg of coke, while 20 consecutive cremations would have required only 740 ($=37.5 \times 20$) kg.

From the tenth cremation onward the coke consumption tended to be uniform, so that by then the refractory masonry was absorbing very little heat. It was for this reason that, in my calculation of the thermal equilibrium for the Auschwitz crematory ovens, I took into consideration the condition of

the oven at the eighteenth cremation, that is, when its refractory masonry absorbed practically no more heat and the oven functioned with a minimum of fuel.

It is evident that the Gusen oven had an accumulation of heat notably lower to that in the above-mentioned chart. Nevertheless the principle still remains valid for this installation.

The difference in coke consumption for the two periods considered above – 47.5 and 30.6 kg – and also for the intermediate period[268] – 37.2 kg – depends *essentially* on the periodicity and number of the cremations, as I explained in point 36 of my reply to Zimmerman.

Zimmerman, in his crass thermotechnical ignorance, rejects these elementary facts, but since the documents confirm that the coke consumption for the period from September 26 to October 15, 1941, was 47.5 kg per corpse, it follows that the consumption of coke for the period from October 31 to November 12 must have been 32,157.5 ($=47.5 \times 677$) kg of coke, so that each of the 345 wheelbarrows of coke used to cremate the 677 corpses during this period would have had to contain on average 93.2 ($=32,157.5 \div 345$) kg of coke! Exactly the opposite of what this dilettante wished to prove!

The soundness of my conclusions is also confirmed by two other documents. The first is the report on the coke consumption of the Gusen oven from January 21 to August 24, 1941, drawn up by the head of the crematorium, Wassner.[269] The other is a reference note, which reported the coke consumption for the period from August 25 to September 24, 1941. [270] In both the documents the amount of coke is expressed in “Zentner,” an old German measure of weight equivalent to 50 kg. In the following table I summarize the dates contained in the document and add the number of cremated corpses taken from the list of deaths in the Gusen Camp, which comes from the published official history of the Mauthausen camp.⁵⁶ The number of deaths refers to the entire month, while the supply of coke is offset daily. However, the difference in the outcome is very slight and actually irrelevant regarding the order of magnitude of the results. In any case, for the overall calculation I will try to be as precise as possible.

Period	coke [“Zentner”]	coke [kg]	corpses cremated	average per day	average coke per corpse
Jan. 29-	226	11,300	250	9	45.2

Feb. 24					
Feb. 25- Mar. 24	271	13,550	375	12	36.1
Mar. 25- Apr. 24	452	22,600	380	13	59.4
Apr. 25- May 24	68	3,400	239	8	14.2
May 25- Jun. 24	164	8,200	199	7	41.2
Jun. 25- Jul. 24	298	14,900	369	12	40.3
Jul. 25- Aug. 24	527	26,350	479	15	55
Aug. 25- Sep. 24	479	23,950	426	14	56.2
Total	2,485	124,250	2,717	11.25	45.7

Two lists exist on the subject of coke consumption at Gusen. The first, for the period of April 25 through May 24, has a consumption of 68 “Zentner” (1 Zentner = 50 kg $\approx$ 110 lbs), but in front of the figure 6 there is a 1, which seems to be struck out (see Ill. 2, p. 128).^[271] Initially, I thought that for the period in question the coke consumption had in fact been 68 and not 168 Zentner, because by adding up all individual entries for coke consumption one obtains a total of 2,006 Zentner, which agrees with the figure in the document. In the first version of the current article I had therefore taken that figure to be abnormal and tried to explain it. However, the second document (see Ill. 3, p. 128)^[272] for the period in question has a consumption of 169 Zentner, which means that the sum of the individual entries in the first document is in error. In the left margin of document 2 there is a column with the consumptions after the 24th of each month and from the consumption of the following month that of the preceding months is subtracted to obtain the actual consumption for the month in question.

The consumption from January 29 through February 24, 1941, is therefore (1,626-1,400=) 226 Zentner; the consumption from February 25 through March 24 is (1,897-1,626=) 271 Zentner; that from March 25 through April 24 is (2,349-1,897=) 452 Zentner and that – which interests us here – from April 25 through May 24 is (2,518-2,349=) 169 Zentner. These figures are identical to those of document 1, except for the consumption from April 25 through May 24, which is 168 Zentner instead of 169.

This consumption corresponds to a total ($169 \times 50 =$) 8,450 kg of coke and to an average consumption of ($8,450 \div 239 =$) 35.35 kg per corpse, which is almost equal to that of March. Hence there is no anomaly in the monthly coke consumptions of the oven.

Let us now try to complete the data of the table.

During the month of January, 220 detainees died, on average 7 per day, so that for the days January 29-31 it may be presumed that roughly 21 detainees died. For the cremation of these corpses one may assume the average resultant quantity of coke for the period from January 29 to February 24, was, to be precise, $45.2 \times 21 = 949$ kg. From September 26 to 29[273] – according to the list of cremations discussed above – 34 corpses were cremated with a consumption of 28 wheelbarrows of coke, that is 1,400 kg. For September 25, in the absence of data, we may assume the data of the 26th, that is, 20 cremations[274] with a coke consumption of 960 kg.

Jan 29. 1.41 - 24.2.41	226 Jambour
" 25.2.41 - 24.2.41	291 "
" 25.2.41 - 24.2.41	452 "
" 25.2.41 - 24.2.41	458 "

III. 2: Document about coke consumption at Gusen camp.

Rückgraben am 29.1.41 - 25.7.41.	
2349	
2548	
1692	29. Jänner - 24.2. (226) 226
2548	25. Februar - 24.3. (291) 291
2682	25 März - 24.4. (452) 452
1542	25 April - 24.5. (169) 169
	20 Jambour
	253 ✓
	377 ✓
	3814

III. 3: Another document on coke consumption at Gusen camp.

Recapitulating, between January 29 and September 30, 1941, 2,792 people died at Gusen and were cremated with a consumption of 127,559 kg of coke. Since the number of non-documented days is 4 in 244, the eventual margin of error in the calculation is totally negligible.

The average consumption of coke per corpse therefore comes out at 45.6 kg ($=127,559 \div 2,792$). The soundness of this calculation is assured by the fact that, as I said above, during the period from September 26 to October 15 the

average consumption of coke was of the same order of magnitude, that is, 47.5 kg per corpse. The average number [\[275\]](#) of daily cremations during this period was also of the same order of magnitude: 9 -10 as against 10 -11 per day.

To the data displayed above we may add that which comes from the list of Gusen cremations under discussion, from which we may conclude that 2,985 (=2,792+193) corpses were cremated in the crematorium of Gusen between January 29 and October 15, 1941, with a coke consumption of 136,739 (=127,559 + 9180) kg, on average 45.8 kg per corpse.

Thus, why should the consumption of coke have been so drastically reduced during the period from October 26 to November 12 so as to be actually less than that obtained here, assuming that the wheelbarrows always contained 60 kg of coke? The Zimmerman hypothesis is therefore senseless.

7.2. Duration of the Cremation Process

In “Body Disposal” Zimmerman writes:

“On November 7, 1941 these two muffles incinerated 94 bodies in a period of 19 hours and 45 minutes, or 47 per muffle. This means that each oven could incinerate a body in 25.2 minutes. This was probably achieved by adding a new body to the oven before the prior body had been totally incinerated, a method which appears to have been envisaged by the Topf instructions discussed earlier. [...] This method should not be confused with multiple body burnings to be discussed in the next part of this study. This 25 minute figure is not far from the Prüfer estimate cited in the prior paragraph. Mattogno totally ignored this information. Rather, he focused on the November 8 information which shows 72 bodies burned. He erroneously claimed that it took 24½ hours to burn these bodies. He has misread the time sheets. The actual burning time for these bodies was between 16 and 17 hours.”

In his response Zimmerman returns obsessively to these presumed “25.2 minutes,” and he hurls various accusations at me: “Mattogno’s knowingly false statement”; Mattogno “misread” the document. Finally, I am supposed to be “unable to read a simple time sheet that deals with these issues.” Worse yet, he attacks the competence of those who *are* able to read this sheet.

Well then, I state and confirm that Zimmerman is not only “unable to read” this document, but also that he has understood nothing of this document due to his total incompetence. And here is the proof of my claim:

In his response our professor explains how he calculated the presumed duration of 25.2 minutes:

“We know the time because the operation started at 11:15 A.M. The last load of coke was added at 5 A.M. on November 8. We know that this last burning only lasted two hours because the time sheet for November 8 starts at 7 A.M.”

And between 11:15 AM of day 7 to 7 AM of day 8 there are 19 hours and 45 minutes. Therefore, the hypothesis of Zimmerman is based on two assumptions:

1. that the first entry in the column labeled “Uhr” refers to the beginning of the cremation;
2. that the number of wheelbarrows of coke appearing next to the times, refers to the coke “added” or “introduced” (p. 24), that is, to the coke put into the gas generators of the furnace.

Both assumptions are erroneous. Let us examine the first.

1. In the registrations for October 6, the first hourly registration appears in the document as 9:15. The second and last is 10:50. At 10:50, [\[276\]](#) according to Zimmerman’s hypothesis, five wheelbarrows of coke (=300 kg) were “added.” Since he claims that the 7 (= 420 kg) wheelbarrows “added” to the five of November 8 were burnt in two hours (between 5:00 and 7:00), giving an hourly consumption of 210 kg, the five wheelbarrows of coke mentioned above must have been consumed in around 100 minutes. So, on October 6 the cremations began at 9:15 and ended at 12:30. It follows that in 195 minutes the furnace cremated 25 corpses, so that each cremation lasted 15.6 minutes!
2. In the registration of October 1 the first hourly indication appearing in the document is 9:15, the last 11:00. According to Zimmerman’s hypothesis, four wheelbarrows of coke (=240 kg) were “added” at 11:00, which would have to have been burnt in around 70 minutes. So, on October 1 the cremations began at 9:15 and were terminated at 12:10. Therefore, 20 corpses were cremated in 175 minutes, which corresponds to a time of 17.5 minutes for each corpse!

But the essential reason why Zimmerman’s hypothesis is false is to be found in the combustion capacity of the furnace grills, or gas generators. This is the only scientific point of departure for an understanding of the Gusen document. The combustion capacity of a grill is the quantity of coke burnt in an hour on one grill of the furnace. The grill capacity is increased – within

certain limits – by the chimney’s draft, which draws air through the gaps of the grill and carries the necessary oxygen to the fuel. For a coke-heated crematory, the maximum admissible draft operating with a forced draft installation (*Saugzug-Anlage*) is a pressure difference corresponding to the pressure of a 30 mm column of water. The fuel consumption corresponding to this draft is about 180 kg of coke per square meter of grill. As each grill of a Gusen furnace had a surface area of $(0.5 \times 0.5 =) 0.25 \text{ m}^2$, the maximum capacity of a grill with a draft of 30 mm of water was $(180 \times 0.25 =) 45 \text{ kg}$ of coke per hour, 90 kg for a grill with two gas generators. Thus, if it is assumed that Zimmerman’s hypothesis is correct, on October 1 the furnace would have worked with a grill capacity of about $(1,200 \text{ kg}[277] \div 130 \text{ min.}[278]) 554 \text{ kg/hour}$, on October 15 with a capacity of around $(960 \text{ kg} \div 190 \text{ min.}[279] =) 303 \text{ kg/hour!}$ From September 26 to October 15 the capacity of the oven grill would have been around $(=9,180 \div 2,300[280]) 240 \text{ kg per hour}$, that is, 2.6 times faster than the theoretical maximum!

It is therefore clear that the column “Uhr” appearing in the document in question cannot refer to the beginning of a cremation. But then, to what does it refer? Perhaps it refers to the coke unloaded into the gas generators at the times indicated by the document? This is not possible either, because the useful volume of a gas generator in a Gusen oven was around 0.2 m^3 . 1 m^3 of metallurgical coke weighs between 380 and 530 kg, which means that each gas generator could accommodate a maximum of about $(530 \times 0.2 =) 110 \text{ kg}$ of coke. In any case, in the document in question the number of wheelbarrows corresponding to times – that is, the respective quantity of coke – is often much greater than the capacity of the gas generators. For example, on November 8 at 16:00 hours 16 wheelbarrows of coke[281] were registered, that is, $(16 \times 60 =) 960 \text{ kg}$, over four times the capacity of two gas generators.

Does the column “Uhr” refer to the coke burnt in the gas generators? This hypothesis is incorrect as well. Let us return to the previous case. Another wheelbarrow of coke was registered at 18:15 on the eighth day (the relative enumeration changes from 24 to 25), so that the 960 kg of coke relative to the time of 16:00 would have to have been burnt in two hours and 15 minutes, which corresponds to a grill capacity of about 427 kg per hour!

Well then, to what does the column “Uhr” refer? The answer is simple: to the coke withdrawn from time to time from the depot and *unloaded* near the oven. Let me explain this in more detail. Following a rational organization of the work – and nobody will deny that the Germans were most efficient at this

– the coke had to be unloaded from time to time near the two gas generators of the oven in such a way that the stokers could carry by shovel a sufficient supply of fuel. As in any unloading of goods, the delegate who undertook the fuel's delivery and who took responsibility for its use gave bureaucratic account of its receipt, indicating the number of the wheelbarrow as well as the time *when the unloading was completed*, not the time when it began. But the oven was already put into operation with the first wheelbarrow. That is why the column "Uhr" in the document under discussion refers not to the beginning of a cremation but to *the end of the unloading* of a series of wheelbarrows of coke.

I can explain myself better with an example. A large supermarket orders 100 cases of mineral water. The truck transporting the cases arrives at 8:00 in the morning and immediately begins unloading them. The work takes four hours, and the warehouseman of the supermarket, having counted the unloaded cases, signs for the receipt of 100 cases at 12 noon. In the meantime the cases have already been placed in the sales circuit and the first cases are sold at 8:15. In the documents the unloading will be recorded as having taken place at 12 noon but the sales as beginning at 8:15.

Now let us return to the Gusen document. In the registrations of November 7, the first datum refers to 11 wheelbarrows of coke (= 660 kg) at 11:15. This signifies that the unloading of these 11 wheelbarrows was recorded as ending at 11:15. The second datum concerns the unloading of two wheelbarrows between 11:15 and 11:30. For this reason the coke which the personnel had finished unloading at 11:15 was already almost totally burnt up.

Therefore the first wheelbarrow was unloaded *before* 11:15, but how long before? If we assume a maximum grill capacity of 90 kg/hour, it can be reckoned that during the preceding seven hours, ($7 \times 90 =$) 630 kg of coke were unloaded and burnt, so that the cremations were initiated at 4:15 while at 11:15 there still remained 30 kg of coke near the gas generators. Consequently, between 11:15 and 11:30 a further two wheelbarrows of coke were emptied. That is how the average duration of each cremation would have gone up to 34 minutes; and this would be the *minimum theoretical* time. The *real* duration would have been undoubtedly greater.

In fact, we know that the oven was out of service between October 16 and 25. During the whole month of October there were 462 deaths at Gusen,[\[282\]](#) but the number of corpses cremated were only 351 (159 from day 1 to day 15

and 192 from day 26 to day 31), so that on November 1 there remained (462–351=) 111 corpses in the morgue to be cremated. To these it is necessary to add the corpses of those detainees who died in the first week of November. In a situation so critical, only Zimmerman could seriously believe that on November 7 the head of the crematorium had waited at least 11 hours (the last registration recording unloading of coke for day 6 was at 22:10) before putting the oven back into service to cremate 94 corpses. On the other hand, the more rational explanation is that, because he had to dispose of some further tens of corpses behind schedule, he ordered a minimum pause in order to hurriedly clean the grills of the gas generators and immediately thereafter put the oven back into operation. In this context, the more probable hypothesis is that the oven was reactivated shortly after midnight.

If, for example, the cremation was started at 0:45, by 11:15 the oven will have burnt 630 kg of coke in ten and a half hours leaving a remnant of 30 kg of coke. This corresponds to a *normal* grill capacity[283] of 60 kg/hour. In this case the average time for one cremation would be around 39 minutes. This is my interpretation.

In this way I dispose of all our “expert’s” thermotechnical fantasies. Therefore I confirm and reconfirm that his unfounded conjecture of 25.2 minutes for the duration of a cremation is “technically absurd.”

As to the efficiency of the oven, Zimmerman finds the following:

“One of the factors I noted in the study is that the ovens [sic!] were still undergoing repairs at the time these efficiencies were being achieved (Body, note 118). Thus on November 6, 7 and 8 there were four hours of repairs on the oven each day. Yet the ovens were able to incinerate 57, 94 and 72 bodies on these days. These numbers suggest very high efficiencies even when undergoing repairs.”

This is yet another of Zimmerman’s impostures. The document to which he refers – the “certification of day labor on special account”[284] of Willing for the period November 6-10, 1941[285] simply mentions “*Ofen Arbeiten*” for days November 6-8. In German, “repairs” means “*Reparaturen*,” “*Ausbesserungen*” or “*Instandsetzungen*,” certainly not “*Arbeiten*,” which is a generic term for work, for example a job of surveillance of the cremation activity, or a job to regulate the roller shutters and the oven blowers. Such an expression does not minimally imply that the ovens “were still undergoing repairs.”

Not having any awareness of the history and technology of cremation,

Zimmerman is necessarily incapable of an organic view of the argument. It is such an organic view that in the end can only weaken his thermotechnical fantasies and validate my own scientific conclusions. For example, I refer to the cremation experiments of the engineer Richard Kessler with an oven heated with coke,[\[286\]](#) from which the conclusion is drawn that the *principal combustion* lasts for about 55 minutes. I also refer to the list of cremations in the crematorium of Westerbork (a Kori oven heated with coke) showing an average cremation time of around 50 minutes,[\[287\]](#) as well as to furnaces for the combustion of animal carcasses functioning with charcoal, to which I will return below.

Not even the Soviet experts, second to none with all their hyperbolic exaggerations, dared to attribute the exceptionally short times of the cremation process to the real temperatures found in practice in their “Guideline diagram for the determination of the time of combustion of corpses in various crematorium ovens as a function of the temperature,” which can be found in their expert reports on the crematoria of Majdanek and Sachsenhausen. On the contrary. For example, they attributed a duration of 120 minutes to the normal temperature of 800°C and a duration of 75 minutes to the temperature of 1,100°C. The scale ends with a duration of 15 minutes at a temperature of 1,500°C. However, this situation can hold only in the gas generator at best, certainly not in the muffle.[\[288\]](#)

7.3. My Alleged “Omissions”

In the article “Die Krematoriumsöfen von Auschwitz-Birkenau”[\[289\]](#) I mentioned in passing the case of the cremations of November 8-9 at Gusen, writing:

“For example, on 8 and 9 November 72 corpses were cremated in around 1,470 minutes with a total consumption of 2,100 kg of coke, that is, on average 29.1 kg per corpse. This means that in each muffle ($72 \div 2 =$) 36 loads of corpses were introduced with a cremation time of about 41 minutes per load.”

As can be seen from the heading of the paragraph in which this passage appears, I exhibited this case not as a determination of the *duration* of the process of cremation but in order to refute the story of multiple cremations, a topic I return to below. In setting out this case I explained provisionally that “the *analysis* of the list of cremations and coke consumption shows that [...]” Therefore, being a simple example, my above assertion does not have any

particular significance, since my conclusions regarding the Gusen document derive precisely from an *analysis* of the *whole* document – not just from the individual registrations contained in it – and are based essentially on the capacity of the furnace grill. It is therefore clear that Zimmerman’s accusation, according to which I “misread” the document regarding the case of November 8-9 is without foundation, so that his suppositions are false.

The duration of around 1,470 minutes is based on a calculation of the grill capacity closest to the maximum, that is, 86 kg/hour, which is still extremely high for a continuous operation of 24 hours.

In conclusion, based on *documentary evidence*, Zimmerman’s hypothesis of an average cremation time of 25.2 minutes is unfounded.

And *technically*? Technically such an hypothesis is senseless according to engineer Kessler’s experiments on cremation. Even the phase, during which water evaporated from the corpse, required on average 28 minutes in an optimum coke-operated oven![\[290\]](#)

7.4. The Documentation on Mauthausen

In my reply to Zimmerman (point 33) I wrote that

“It is true that the correspondence between the Topf firm and the SS-Neubauleitung (finally Bauleitung) of Mauthausen for 1941 is almost certainly complete, but the same thing can definitely not be said for the following years.”

Zimmerman maintains that “this is blatantly and knowingly false:”

“There is not as much correspondence after October 1941 because there was no further oven installation until January 1945 in Mauthausen. Prior to November 1941 there had been two installations in Gusen – the original one in February 1941 and the overhaul in October 1941. This is what accounts for so much correspondence. However, there is enough paper trail in the file to show that no overhaul could have occurred from November 1941 to August 1943, and probably none occurred after August 1943.”

Let us now see who tells falsehoods. The documentation on Mauthausen contains about 120 documents with dates between February[\[291\]](#) and December 1941. However, it is not “complete” (at best, it is *nearly* complete), because already one of the two most important documents is missing from this documentation, even though it was received and registered by the “S.S. Neubauleitung Mauthausen.” This is the letter of Topf dated

July 14, 1941, stating that in the two-muffle Topf oven heated with coke it was possible to cremate 30 – 36 corpses in about 10 hours. The documentation contains the request of the *SS-Neubauleitung* of Mauthausen (letter of July 9, 1941), but not Topf's reply, which is at Weimar, where it was accidentally discovered by J.C. Pressac. In addition, the construction drawing D58479 of Topf (mentioned in the letter of April 21) is missing from the documentation as well as all invoices. For example, the invoice for 118 RM, that for 80 RM, and the one for 108 RM dated May 2 (mentioned in the letter of June 12); the invoice for 303 RM of August 25 (mentioned in the letter of September 23); that of September 4 for 1,594 RM (mentioned in the letter of October 11); the invoice for 165 RM of November 3, 1941, and respectively those for 622.30 RM and 361.90 RM of November 21 (mentioned in the letter of December 14). Also missing from the documentation are the financial documents regarding payments made by the SS, in particular the down payments (*Abschlagszahlungen*), the final invoices (*Schlussrechnungen*), the final account statements (*Schlussabrechnung*). By contrast, such documents are preserved for the crematory ovens of Auschwitz.[\[292\]](#)

How many other important documents have been removed from correspondence between the Topf firm and the *SS-Neubauleitung*? I do not know, but the examples mentioned should be cause for thought. Let us now consider the subsequent years. In the following tables I summarize data relevant to the consistency of the documentation:

1942	DAYS	DOCS	1943	DAYS	DOCS
January	From day 5 to day 28	12	January	From 8 to 23	9
February	Days 3 and 6	2	February	13, 24 (3 documents)	4
March	13	1	March	-	-
April	-	-	April	22 (2 documents)	2
May	-	-	May	5	1
June	-	-	June	-	-
July	-	-	July	-	-
August	From 17 to 28	4	August	11, 28	2
September	16, 26 and 30	3	September	-	-
October	From 19 to 24	4	October	-	-

November	3,13, 17, 20,30	5	November	-	-
December	21 (2 documents)	2	December	-	-
1944	DAYS	DOCS	1945	DAYS	DOCS
January	-	-	January	3, 21 (2 documents)	3
February	-	-	February	-	-
March	-	-	March	-	-
April	-	-	April	-	-
May	-	-			
July	-	-			
July	-	-			
August	-	-			
September	-	-			
October	-	-			
November	-	-			
December	20	1			

Let us recapitulate. There is a blank of 190 days in the documentation for the year 1942, from February 7 to August 16 (with only one document, that for March 13). For 1943, from February 25 to December 31 the documentary gap is 310 days (with just two documents for April, one for May, and two for August). For 7 months (March, June, July, September, October, November and December) there is not a single document. For 1944 (366 days) there is a documentary gap of 365 days! Just one document, dated December 20, features for the whole year. For 1945 there are only three documents (for January). For 22 months out of 37, from January 1942 to January 1945, there is not even one document!

In spite of this, Zimmerman quite incredibly has the impudence to say that my assertions on the incompleteness of the documentation “is blatantly and knowingly false!”

His explanation for the enormous documentary gaps is radically challenged by the fact that he presupposes *a priori* the very thing, which he wants to prove: Starting with the presupposition that the documentation concerns only “oven installation,” he concludes that the documentation is complete since there was no other “oven installation” until January 1945. But how can it be excluded that further replacements of the refractory masonry of the Gusen oven were not made during the long periods of the documentary

gaps? Only by an *a priori* and opportunistic negation that this could have taken place. And this is precisely what Zimmerman does.

Here our professor gives yet another demonstration of his deceptiveness, since the “correspondence” on the second “oven installation” (the one installed at Mauthausen in January 1945) contains just two documents! And how can Zimmerman seriously claim that this “correspondence” is *complete*? Hence, also in this case it is evident that the documentation is extremely full of gaps and that our professor lies, knowing that he lies.

Thus the argument of the exceptional long life of the refractory masonry in the Gusen oven (around 30,000 according to the estimate of the International Red Cross)[\[293\]](#) also collapses, since it is not known how many times the refractory material was replaced, which is true for the Kori ovens of Mauthausen as well.

7.5. The Gusen Oven Planned “with a Defect”?

Zimmerman maintains that the Gusen oven was badly constructed by the Topf firm and this – and not the wear following the number of cremations carried out – was responsible for the necessity of replacing the refractory masonry in October of 1941. In “Body Disposal” Zimmerman wrote:

“It is possible that the Gusen ovens may not have originally been built correctly.”

In his response he returns to this question stating:

“I speculated that perhaps the overhaul had to do with a defect in the Gusen ovens.”

On both occasions, our professor relies on the Topf letter of April 10, 1943, which is supposed to testify that “Topf admitted that the Krema IV ovens at Auschwitz were made defectively.” He quotes the following translation of the first part of the document in question:[\[294\]](#)

“In response to your written communication referred to above, we inform you that we have instructed our foreman, Mr. Koch, to take care of the cracks that apparently have recently occurred in the eight muffle oven of Krema IV. At the same time, we also took note of the agreement between your construction leader, SS-Major Bischoff and our senior engineer Mr. Prufer according to which we will take care, at no cost to you, of the defects that have appeared, within two months of their start-up, in the cremation ovens built by us (innerhalb zwei Monaten nach Inbetriebnahme der Ofen auftreten.) Understandably we take it as a given

that the defects have appeared because of defective operation, and not because of overheating the ovens or by scraping away the interior masonry with the stoking devices, etc.

(Hierbei ist selbstverständlich^[295] Voraussetzung, dass die evtl. ^[296] aufgetretenen Mängel infolge fehlerhafter Ausführung entstanden sind und nicht etwa durch Überhitzung der Öfen bzw. durch Abstoßen der inneren Ausmauerung durch die Schürgeräte usw.)^[297]

Zimmerman comments:

“Therefore, Topf clearly accepted responsibility for defects under the warranty – though reluctantly.”

With this comment Zimmerman completely distorts the significance of the text, which is as follows: According to the existing agreement between Bischoff and Prüfer, Topf were held to repair *gratis* all breakdowns which were verified within the two months of the guarantee, beginning with installation entering into operation, but *only on the condition* that such breakdowns were due to construction errors of the oven *and not* due to its improper usage. Topf had given the installer Koch the job of repairing “*die jetzt eingetretenen Schäden*,” but this does not mean that the Topf firm had “clearly accepted responsibility for defects.” It had only accepted the work of repairing the damages (“*Schäden zu beseitigen*”), but without in any way admitting that such repairs went back to the above-mentioned guarantee. If Topf had admitted that the damages were due to a construction error of the oven, why did the letter insist on the fact the guarantee did not cover damages caused by an error in usage? It is clear that the question of responsibility was still open.

In a word, the sense of the letter is *not* what Zimmerman claims it to be (the damages were caused by faulty construction, so we carry out the repairs free of charge according to the terms of the contract). What it really says is: If the damages are due to faulty construction of the oven (and not due to an error in usage), then we carry out the repairs free of charge according to the terms of the contract.

Having misrepresented the sense of the above document regarding these Auschwitz ovens, Zimmerman produces another “proof” of the bad construction of the Gusen oven:

“However, on March 13, 1941, six weeks after the ovens had been installed, the camp authorities complained that they had found ‘several defects’ (‘verschiedene Mängel’^[298]) in the ovens and requested

material to fix them. More repair materials were ordered in June. Therefore, there is strong evidence that the first double muffle oven installed in Gusen was not made correctly.”

Well, let’s look at the facts the way they really are. On March 13, 1941, the *SS-Neubauleitung K.L. Mauthausen* wrote the following letter to Topf: [\[299\]](#)

*“Our construction site in Gusen informed us that various defects have been detected at the incineration oven. The sheating shows that it is peeling off in several areas. We ask you therefore to send us immediately
10 sacks Monolit and
6 pieces Monolit crosses
so that the necessary material for repairs is available in case of larger damages. We ask you for a delivery without any delay. Order sheet and bill of lading with restriction sheet I are enclosed.”*

Here the term “sheating” (*Ummantelung*) refers to the refractory dressing of the muffles – as can be seen from the request for 6 “Monolit crosses,” which were the refractory bars of the muffle grills. They were therefore “peeling” at various points.

As Zimmerman indicated, the snag arises “six weeks after the ovens had been installed,” so that the oven was still under guarantee by Topf. In fact, according to an arrangement of March 1938, the guarantee “for those parts of the incineration installation in contact with fire”[\[300\]](#) held for one year (6 months for the refractory overlay of the gas generators).[\[301\]](#)

Therefore, if – as Zimmerman claims – the above snag was due to the fact that “the first double muffle oven installed in Gusen was not made correctly,” Topf, by accepting “though reluctantly” its responsibility, would have sent the material for the repairs free of charge. Instead, as is shown by the letter of March 18, 1941, Topf debited the “*SS-Neubauleitung KL Mauthausen*” with 80 RM for “10 sacks = 500 kg Monolit” and with 118 RM for “6 pieces cross grills.” In this letter Topf specifies:[\[302\]](#)

“We accept the order based on the general terms of delivery no. B known to you.”

This means that the terms of delivery, which also defines the conditions of a guarantee similar to the “general terms of delivery no. A,” completely excluded the responsibility of Topf.

At this point, the document turns against Zimmerman’s interpretation nullifying his hypothesis. After hardly 6 weeks, the refractory masonry of the

muffles was already “peeling” at various points on account of the cremation of fewer than 500 corpses, 250 per muffle!

Let us turn to the “more repair materials” which “were ordered in June.” The only materials supplied to Gusen in June 1941 were 50 sacks of “Monolit”^[303] forwarded by the firm Alphons Custodis of Düsseldorf on behalf of the Topf firm and dated June 25.^[304] Nevertheless, this material was not used for repairs, but was part of the supply of materials, which Topf sent to Gusen for the second crematory double-muffle oven. This comes out clearly from the letter of Topf dated June 12 cited above in which it says:^[305]

“The 50 sacks of Monolit mentioned by you here are part of the construction material that we delivered for the construction of a new incineration oven; we will not send you a special invoice for this material.”

This “new crematory oven” was actually the result of a misunderstanding. Topf believed that the *SS-Neubauleitung* of Mauthausen had ordered it on December 6, 1940, with “order no. 41 D 80,”^[306] while it concerned an error due to a change in the heating system of the already installed oven (from heating with naphtha to heating with coke).^[307]

This is what Zimmerman’s “strong evidence” has been reduced to! So our professor has either understood nothing at all or resorts to deception.

Following the above misunderstanding, Topf had already conveyed the following refractory and insulating material for the oven, as emerges from Topf’s letter of September 4, 1941:

- ³⁵₁₇ 2,100 fire-bricks of various sizes
- ³⁵₁₇ 1,200 kg of refractory mortar
- ³⁵₁₇ 1,000 insulating bricks
- ³⁵₁₇ 400 kg of insulating mortar
- ³⁵₁₇ 3,000 kg of solid monolith

Moreover, this letter also indicates that the *SS-Neubauleitung* of Mauthausen, although it had cancelled the order for the second Gusen oven, nevertheless wished to purchase (*ankaufen*)^[308] this material “for later repair works.”^[309]

Note the date: September 4, 1941. The official request for the “immediate commissioning of one of your oven experts for the repair of the crematory oven in the labor camp Gusen” was moreover forwarded twenty days later by the construction office of Mauthausen on September 24.^[310] Probably the

first signs of damage to the oven's refractory masonry were already showing, damage which eventually became irreparable.

Whatever the case, it remains a fact that twenty days earlier, at a time when fewer than 2,700 cremations had been carried out in the Gusen oven (1,350 per muffle), the construction office of Mauthausen was already planning to have at its disposal refractory material "for later repair works."

Already from this, one infers that the construction office did not trust the marvelous longevity of the refractors in the Gusen oven that Zimmerman wishes to attribute to them.

The high fragility of the Topf ovens is reflected in many documents of the Auschwitz Central Construction Office. I will limit myself here to one of the first documents concerning the double-muffle oven, which was the most solid of the Topf series of ovens. The first double-muffle oven of crematorium I at Auschwitz went into operation on August 15, 1940. Five months later, on January 8, 1941, the head of construction SS-Untersturmführer Schlachter sent Topf a letter in which he stated:[\[311\]](#)

"SS New Construction Office has already informed you by cable that the first oven unit has already been damaged on account of high usage and can therefore not be fully operated any more. It is therefore indispensable that the extension of the plant is begun."

Up to January 8, 1941, 8,496 detainees had been registered at Auschwitz. [\[312\]](#) If we follow the "Polish War Crimes Office," some 1,600 detainees died between June 1940 and January 1941. [\[313\]](#) Hence, the oven had "already been damaged" after *less than* 800 cremations per muffle!

8. The Durability of the Oven's Refractory Masonry

8.1. The Electric Oven of Erfurt: 1939 or 1941?

In describing the third electric oven of Erfurt in an article published on October 25, 1941, engineer Rudolf Jakobskötter emphasized that the durability of refractory material may exceed 2,000 cremations achieved so far and may actually reach 4,000 cremations in future due to a new oven design.⁵² I commented that German technology had not yet developed fire-resistant muffle capable of withstanding 4000 cremations in 1941. I also criticized Zimmerman for falsely claiming that the information cited above referred to "cremation technology in the 1930's" ("Observations," point 30, see p. 102).

In “My Response” Zimmerman rejected my accusation of “bad faith” since “the article was *published* in 1941 while Jakobskotter’s [sic] figures go to 1939.” By so writing, Zimmerman completely confirms his obvious deceit. It is true that the third Erfurt oven “was finished on December 1, 1939” and was “slowly dried “ until January 31, 1940,[\[314\]](#) but it is false that “Jakobskotter’s figures go to 1939.” On page 586 of Jakobskötter’s article there is a table headed “Incinerations and electricity consumption in the electr. incineration ovens at Erfurt.” The table summarizes the practical results of three ovens at Erfurt. Those of the third oven stem from February 1940 to April 1941, so that Jakobskötter did not write his article before *May* 1941. Naturally, Zimmerman takes good care not to mention these dates. As we see, the impudence of this imposter is simply unbelievable.

Zimmerman again objects:

“The electric ovens had started to be manufactured in 1933. However, problems arose after the development of the first electric oven in 1933. Jakobskotter [sic] writes: ‘Nachdem in dem elektrischen Ofen uber[sic] 1300 Leichen eingeaschert[sic] worden waren, machte sich eine Erneuerung nötig’[sic]. (After over 1,300 bodies had been cremated in the electric oven, a renovation was required). Therefore, we know that there were problems which had arisen with this type of oven.”

To be precise, according to the cited table on p. 568 of the article, the number of cremations was 1,294. Zimmerman in “Body Disposal” comments thus:

“The first generation could burn 2,000 bodies. The second generation, beginning in 1935, had a life of 3,000 bodies which was expected to increase to 4,000 bodies. A third generation would go into effect in 1939. No durability was specified for the third generation. Jakobskotter [sic] did state that ‘they expect to have even higher numbers’[\[315\]](#)¹ for future ovens.’”

Zimmerman distorts the succession of the ovens’ “generations”: The first “generation” is the first oven, which carried out 1,294 cremations, the second is the second oven, which carried out 2,910 cremations (according to the table on p. 586), the third is the third oven, for which Jakobskötter expected “an even longer durability.”[\[316\]](#)

In this context, how should we place the phrase “while so far muffles withstood only 2,000 cremations, depending on their design”? To what does the number of 2,000 cremations refer? Certainly not to the first oven, which

had carried out 1,294 cremations. It also did not refer to the second oven, which had carried out 2,910 cremations. On the other hand, the “first generation” oven, to which Zimmerman attributes 2,000 cremations, was a single oven with a single muffle. But then, why does Jakobskötter speak of “the muffles,” in the plural, and why does he employ the expression “depending on their design,” seeing that the muffle was of only one type?

It is clear that Jakobskötter is referring to oven types preceding the electric oven, those heated with coke and/or gas. He therefore affirms that the results of the second electric oven, as far as the number of cremations is concerned, had surpassed those of other types of ovens, and this is obvious as we will see in the next paragraph.

Granted that the Jakobskötter’s article was not written before May 1941 and that it was published in October 1941, it is clear that the phrase “The construction firm is counting on a life span of 4000 cremations per muffle in future” means that by the end of October 1941 a “life span of 4000 cremations” had not yet been attained. If it were any different, Jakobskötter would have written it clearly.

On the other hand, the text says only a little more about expectations for an indeterminate future (“künftig”): the German verb “rechnen” means “to consider to be possible and probable”[\[317\]](#) That an expectation must necessarily be realized, is not expressed. And since the expectation of 4,000 cremations on the part of the “construction firm” (Topf) went back to at least May 1941 and looked forward to the future, the expectation could not refer to the third Erfurt oven, which, at the time Jakobskötter wrote the article, had already carried out 1,417 cremations.

And if finally Jakobskötter expected “an even longer life span” for the third oven in comparison with the second oven, this was necessarily less than 4,000 cremations. This expectation was justified by the fact that experiments done with the first two ovens made it possible to overcome the drawbacks, which occurred in the first oven: the formation of smoke caused by the “high” draft of up to 24 mm water column. The combustion gases passed the muffle faster than the time required for the carbon particles to burn completely, so that they formed smoke instead.

8.2. The Electric Oven of Erfurt: the Heating System

Zimmerman again objects:

“Moreover, Mattogno ignored my basic criticism that the Jakobskötter

[sic] study dealt with electric ovens. The concentration camps used coke fired ovens, many of which had been converted from oil burning.”

With this “basic criticism” Zimmerman does no more than – once again – draw attention to his crass ignorance. This poor naïve person does not know that the electric oven, by uniformly distributing the heat generated, had a longer life span than coke ovens, because its refractory masonry was subjected to less stress.

The first electric crematorium went into operation at Biel in Switzerland on August 31, 1933. Its designer, engineer Hans Keller, wrote in February 1935:[\[318\]](#)

“So far 200 cremation were carried out in the electric oven. The fire-proof bricks still look like new, which cannot be said for a coke oven after this number of incinerations. [...]

The heat distribution of this oven is more even, which contributes to the increase of its life span.”

Therefore, the life of the refractory masonry in a coke-fired oven was inferior to that of an electric oven. And if the life span of an electric oven in 1941 was 3,000 cremations, then that of a coke oven was still less!

Quod erat demonstrandum! (Which had to be demonstrated!)

8.3. Factors Influencing the Longevity of the Refractory Masonry

In his crass ignorance of the technology of cremation, Zimmerman disregards essential factors which influenced the longevity of the refractory masonry:

1. the mass
2. the quality of the refractors
3. the exposure to flames of the refractory masonry

Let us examine these factors

1. Our naïve professor does not know that the ovens of civilian crematoria had a refractory mass enormously larger than the ovens of Auschwitz-Birkenau. Normally the refractory masonry of one muffle weighed about 6,500 kg (the recuperator about 8,200 kg).[\[319\]](#)

The coke-heated oven tendered on June 2, 1937, by the firm W. Müller of Allach “to the Reich Leader SS of the NSdAP, Munich Karlstrasse,” that is, to Dachau, had an additional 15,500 kg of refractory material.[\[320\]](#)

Like the Topf ovens of Auschwitz-Birkenau, the oven had no recuperator. According to the “List of materials for a Topf-double cremation oven” drawn up by Topf on January 23, 1943, this oven – the Auschwitz model – had refractory material consisting of 1,600 ordinary fire-bricks (*Schamotte-Normalsteine*) and 900 wedge-shaped bricks (*Keilsteine*). [321] In terms of weight, around 8,600 kg for two muffles, about 4,300 kg per muffle with a gas generator. Of these 4,300 kg, about 2,000 kg were for the gas generator, so that the refractory material of the muffle weighed about 2,300 kg. [322] The refractory material of an eight-muffle oven consisted of 4,500 normal fire-bricks and 1,600 wedge-shaped bricks; [323] in terms of weight, around 24,100 kg, that is, about 3,000 kg for one muffle and ½ a gas generator, [324] or about 2,000 kg for one muffle. The refractory masonry for a three-muffle oven, to judge from a comparison in price, must have had an intermediate weight of refractory masonry, certainly less than 2,300 kg.

The “cremation installation for the SS in Belgrade” tendered by the firm Didier-Werk on August 26, 1943, made provision for 6,600 kg of refractory material, 1,100 kg of wedge-shaped fire-bricks and 5,500 kg of ordinary fire-bricks. [325]

Also, the Kori oven with one muffle was notably more massive than ½ oven from Topf with two muffles. If the SS chose the Topf ovens for Auschwitz-Birkenau, then this selection was certainly not due to the fact the Topf ovens were better than those from other firms – on the contrary! It depended on the fact that they cost much less. A one-muffle Kori oven cost 4,500 RM without accessories, while a two-muffle Topf oven (the third Auschwitz oven) cost 6,378 RM. Such a competitive cost (6,378 RM as against 9,000 RM, the crematory rooms costing the same) depended *also* on saving refractory material, which was achieved by assembling 2, 3, and 4 muffles together in one oven. [326]

2. Let us now consider the quality of the refractors. Already from the fact that Germany was in a state of war, it is easy to see intuitively that the refractory material used for the crematory ovens could not be of the same quality as that used for civilian crematoria in peacetime.

It was not by chance that Topf, already by the end of 1940, issued no guarantee for the refractory material, not even if it wore out with correct usage of the facility: [327]

“The guarantee does not include the regular wear of the fire-proof

masonry, namely of the grills, and other parts exposed to the fire.”

The Topf operating instructions for a two-muffle oven recommends that the temperature not exceed 1,100°C, and for a three-muffle oven 1,000°C. This means that the refractory masonry of a three-muffle oven could sustain a smaller thermal load and so had a weight-quality ratio less than that of a two-muffle oven, which was already notably inferior to that of the civilian ovens.

3. The wear on the refractory masonry was essentially caused by the open flames which assailed it. While in a coke oven the heat necessary for the cremation was provided by open flames, which continuously attacked the refractory masonry, in an electric oven this heat was provided by electrical incandescent resistances. Here the refractory masonry endured much less strain, as resulted from the experiment with the Biel crematorium, referred to by Jakobskötter on p. 580 of his article:

- The electric oven required 388,000 Kcal (thousands of calories) for its heating, the coke oven 2,100,000 Kcal.

- For a six-day week of work with seven cremations, an electric oven required 880,000 Kcal, a coke oven 7,700.000 Kcal, so that the electric oven used around 11,5% of the heat used by a coke oven. By contrast, the thermal wear suffered by a coke oven was over eight times higher.

Therefore my assumption of 3,000 cremations for the life of the refractory masonry is really optimistic!

8.4. The Crematoria of Paris and Milan

In “Body Disposal” Zimmerman wrote about the huge number of cremations in crematoria in southern Paris and Milan without any noticeable damage. The Paris crematorium mentioned by Zimmerman is that of Père Lachaise, but was situated in the eastern, not southern sector. A provisional oven with the Gorini system was initially installed in this crematorium which came into operation on October 22, 1887.[\[328\]](#) The definitive oven with a system of Toisul and Fradet began operating on August 5, 1889.[\[329\]](#) In my “Observations” I maintained that the numbers of *corpses* cremated were the opposite of huge (point 28, see p. 100). In “My Response” Zimmerman objects that the numbers reported by me referred only to the cremations arranged by families. Apart from these, there were two other categories of cremation, those “for paupers and dissecting tables.” He does not know into which category were included the “3,743 stillborn children” mentioned in his

article.

It is true that there were other cremations in the Père Lachaise crematorium beyond those which I listed, but cremations *of what*? In statistics going back to 1904 the same number of *corpses* quoted above by me for the years 1889-1892 is indicated, to which two categories are effectively added, one of the “*Anatomienleichen*” (dissected corpses, 7,429 from 1889 to 1892), the other of “*Embryos*” (3,960 from 1889 to 1892).^[330] I know well what the “embryos” are.^[331] But what were the “*Anatomienleichen*?” Corpses and body parts dissected in the anatomy theaters. I most certainly cannot believe that the heart of one corpse, the liver of another, leg of yet another, a brain of a fourth corpse, a body organ of a fifth were cremated individually, so that here one should not speak of 7,429 corpses, but of 7,429 parts of corpses. It is precisely for this reason that the cremations of *corpses* were charged under separate cover in the official statistics. Be that as it may, the fact is that the oven of Toisul and Fradet on one hand and the ovens of the nineteen thirties and forties on the other hand cannot be directly compared because, as I explained in my “Observations,” this installation of the late 1800s was structured on three levels and its massive refractories were impressive.

As to the Milan crematorium, which was on a par with the one of Paris, Zimmerman’s source makes a huge blunder. 271 cremations were carried out in this crematorium between 1876 and 1883,⁵¹ and 486^[332] cremations between 1884 and 1893,^[333] so that it has been falsely cited as an example of the long life of refractory masonry in ovens, which were successively installed.

9. Multiple Cremations

Leaving aside the declarations of “eyewitnesses,” which are worth as much as Zimmerman’s claims, in order to prove the reality of “multiple” cremations, our professor places his trust in Bischoff’s letter of June 28, 1943. He thinks – perhaps seriously – that this document presents a “dilemma” for me. In “Body Disposal” he writes:

“The real dilemma for Mattogno was in the Bauleitung figures given on June 28, 1943, discussed earlier, that 4,416 bodies could be burned in a 24 hour period in the four new crematoria, or 2,208 in a 12 hour period. When the 7,840 kilograms of coke usage for a 12 hour period are divided

by the 2,208 bodies which could be cremated in a 12 hour period, the average comes out to about 3,5 kilograms per body.”

These data – which I will elaborate on in more detail below – are not only not a “dilemma” for me, but constitute one of the fundamental *proofs* of the technical absurdity of the cremation capacity appearing in this letter.

The true “dilemma” is Zimmerman’s: If it was possible to cremate one corpse in 15 minutes with 3.5 kg of coke, how are we to explain that the Gusen oven consumed a minimum quantity of coke at least 9 times as high? If it was so simple to save 92% of the fuel at a time when Germany could not afford to waste anything, much less its coke (and if it was so simple to save 75% of the cremation time), how is it that at Gusen this miraculous “multiple” cremation could not be realized? Why is it that for each cremation about 27 kg of coke was thrown away?

Jährling’s file memo of March 17, 1943, calculates the coke consumption of the Birkenau crematoria for 12 hours of operation. 2,800 kg of coke for each of crematoria II and III were foreseen, 1,120 kg for each of the crematoria IV and V.[\[334\]](#) The above letter of Bischoff attributes a cremation capacity of 1,440 corpses in 24 hours – so 720 corpses in 12 hours – for each of II and III a capacity of 768 corpses in 24 hours – therefore 384 in 12 hours – for each of Kremas IV and V.

If these data were realistic, the coke consumption for each corpse would have been about $(2,800 \div 720 =)$ 3.9 kg for Kremas II/III and about $(1,120 \div 384 =)$ 2.9 kg for Kremas IV/V.

Regarding the coke consumption of the Topf ovens, the only fact *certified by the documents* is that for the Gusen oven. During the period of its greatest activity, from October 31 to November 12, 1941, the Gusen oven cremated 677 corpses with a coke consumption of 345 wheelbarrows of coke, that is $(20,700 \div 677 =)$ 20,700 kg. The average consumption of coke per corpse was therefore about 30.6 kg. For this reason, this *experimental* result is the only point of departure for a *scientific* discussion of the subject.

The Auschwitz double-muffle oven was structurally similar to the Gusen oven, so that, without going into technical details, it can be said that the coke consumption of the two types of ovens was approximately equal.

A three-muffle oven of Crema II/III was no different from a two-muffle oven with a third muffle interposed. It is true that the central muffle enjoyed the thermotechnical advantage of gas combustion at a high temperature originating from the two lateral muffles, which reduced its specific coke

consumption considerably. Nevertheless, the two lateral muffles did not technically enjoy any thermotechnical benefit, since the flow of gases originating from the gas generators traveled in the direction of the central muffle, from which it was introduced into the smoke conduit. Hence the two lateral muffles heated the central muffle, but were not themselves heated by this muffle, from which we deduce that two lateral muffles had a coke consumption approximately equal to that of a double-muffle oven.

In conclusion, the two lateral muffles behaved like a two-muffle oven: they cremated in the same time – around one hour [\[335\]](#) – and required the same amount of fuel – about 30 kg of coke. Even if assuming that the central muffle did not consume any heat, the cremation of three corpses would nevertheless have needed on average of around $((30+30) \div 3 =)$ 20 kg of coke.

In an eight-muffle oven, each of the four gas generators served two muffles: the combustion gas passed from the first to the second muffle and from there it was led into the flue. Even if assuming that the second muffle did not consume any heat, the cremation of two corpses would on average have needed $(30 \div 2 =)$ 15 kg of coke. [\[336\]](#)

Zimmerman imagines that the average coke consumption of “about 3.5 kilograms per body” depends on “multiple” cremations, which, according to the data in Bischoff’s letter of June 28, 1943, means that the Birkenau ovens cremated four corpses in a single muffle in one hour. Let us see how founded this hypothesis is.

The only installations which carried out the equivalent of a multiple cremation were those using animal carcasses for fuel. The most important manufacturer was the Berlin firm of H. Kori. Oven model 1a could burn 250 kg of organic material in five hours with a consumption of 110 kg of fossilized carbon, that is, the equivalent of four corpses of about 62.5 kg each, so with a consumption per corpse of 27.5 kg of fossilized carbon in 75 minutes. The most prestigious model, oven 4b, burned 900 kg of organic material in 13.5 hours with a consumption of 300 kg of fossilized carbon. This is for example equivalent to the simultaneous cremation of 15 corpses of 60 kg in an average time of 54 minutes each and a coke consumption of 20 kg per corpse. [\[337\]](#)

These experimental results demonstrate that by increasing the load of organic burning material, one increased either the corresponding fuel consumption or the duration of the combustion process. Hence, should “multiple” cremations in the Birkenau ovens have been successful, this would

not have been of any effective advantage regarding either the duration or the coke consumption of the cremations. Therefore, “multiple” cremations would only have multiplied the duration of the cremation process and the coke consumption by the number of corpses loaded into the muffles.

The cremation of many corpses in one muffle in an oven planned for the cremation of only one single corpse at a time would have caused insuperable thermotechnical problems. Here I limit myself to briefly hinting at the most important of such problems for a three-muffle oven.

A cremation without a coffin develops in two principal phases. The initial endothermic phase of evaporation of the water in the corpse, which removes a large quantity of heat and lowers the temperature in the muffle, and the final exothermic phase (up to the peak of the corpse’s main combustion), in which the corpse itself burns, producing heat.

During the first phase of the cremation process, the water evaporation from four corpses in a single muffle would have led to a drastic reduction of the oven’s temperature as well as of the smoke with a consequent reduction in the draft. Reducing the chimney’s draft would have had the effect of reducing the draft of the furnace (which depended on it), ending up in a lowering of the capacity of the oven’s grills. For this reason, the availability of heat at the time it was most needed would also have been diminished. The reduction of the muffle’s temperature to below 600°C would have had further deleterious effects. For example, the heavy hydrocarbons formed by the gasification of the corpses would have remained unburned and at the lower temperature the corpses would only have been carbonized.

Besides, the introduction of four corpses into a single muffle would have brought about physical problems for the draft. The corpses would have obstructed the three inter-muffle apertures that linked the lateral muffles with the central one, blocking the passage of combustion products from the gas generators. The four corpses placed on the grill of the central muffle would have obstructed the existing spaces between the bars of the grill finally blocking the passage of the gas from the gas generator by getting into the smoke conduit. This would have ultimately diminished the chimney’s draft and that of the furnace, with a further diminution in the availability of heat.

If, after hours of efforts, all these difficulties had been overcome, during the exothermic phase of the principal combustion, the four corpses together with the flow of gas from the gas generator would have greatly surpassed the terminal thermal load of the muffles. That is, they would have produced a

quantity of heat above that which the refractory masonry could sustain, thus damaging it (fusion of the refractors).

Finally, the 12 corpses cremated in each oven in an hour, together with the gases made by the gas generators, would have produced a quantity of smoke too great for the crematory chimney to get rid of when reckoned for normal usage (one corpse per hour per muffle).

In conclusion: In a three-muffle oven, the cremation of four corpses per muffle, had it succeeded, would have required at least ($30 \times 8 =$) 240 kg of coke, and the duration of the cremation process would have been not less than four hours. The cremation capacity of Kremas II/III would then each have been 360 corpses in 24 hours, and the coke consumption 20 kg per corpse. The cremation capacity of the Kremas IV and V would have been 192 corpses in 24 hours, the coke consumption 15 kg.

Therefore, the information in Bischoff's letter of June 28, 1943, is *technically absurd*, and only naïve people like Zimmerman could take it seriously.

10. The Duration of the Cremation Process at Auschwitz

10.1. The Ovens of Ignis Hüttenbau Co.

I asserted earlier that Zimmerman's conjectures with respect to the duration of a cremation in the oven at Gusen as lasting 25.2 minutes are technically absurd, and I have already furnished various items of proof, such as Kessler's cremation experiments, the results of the operation of the Westerbork oven, the results of the operation of the ovens for the cremation of animal carcasses, or the Soviet guideline diagram. Here, I shall present an even more stringent proof: the results of the operation of the four crematorium ovens installed in the Theresienstadt crematorium by Ignis Hüttenbau Co. of Teplitz-Schönau, now Teplice in the Czech Republic. Those installations were among the most efficient of the time. They were naphtha-based, with a controllable burner that allowed the fuel consumption to be adjusted to the various phases of the cremation. They also possessed a sophisticated supply system of combustion air consisting of sixteen pipes – eight on each side – linked to a blower and set at various points in the wall of the muffle. They could be individually throttled. The enormous size of the muffle – which had a height of 100 cm, a width of 90 cm and a length of 2.60 meters – allowed the cremation to be carried out in a most economical way,

which was as follows:

After the warming-up period, the first corpse was introduced into the oven on a stretcher made of raw boards. The stretcher was placed into the front portion of the muffle, where it was exposed to the combustion air coming from the nozzles installed there. It burned rapidly. At the same time the corpse began to dry out. After some 30-35 minutes, when the drying process had progressed far enough or was complete, the dry and disarticulated body was raked into the rear part of the muffle, close to the burner, by means of a four meter long rake, operated from a special opening in the back of the oven, and then underwent the proper combustion. In this section, the corpse was in direct contact with the controllable flame of the burner and with the combustion air introduced through the nozzles installed here.

The ashes were removed through a dedicated opening in the rear portion of the oven. In continuous operation, the oven thus contained two corpses at a time, one in the drying phase, the other in the combustion phase, and the duration of the cremation process was generally equal to the time needed to dry a corpse. For this cremation plant, name lists are available that indicate also the time necessary for the cremations. From the records concerning a sample of 717 cremations carried out between October 3 and November 15, 1943, a period of 41 operating days,[\[338\]](#) an average incineration time of 35.5 minutes for female corpses and 36.5 minutes for male corpses can be computed.

The bottom of the Ignis-Hüttenbau ovens was a solid floor, 2.60 meters in length. It had no openings but led step by step into a shaft, which was the post-combustion chamber, and then into a final shaft, somewhat lower, the ash receptacle. The combustion of the corpses thus took place in a horizontal direction.[\[339\]](#)

Hence, whereas the Ignis-Hüttenbau oven could accommodate in its muffle a fresh corpse as soon as the body introduced earlier had dried out, with a Topf oven one had to wait until an advanced stage of the incineration process was reached. Already for that reason the time needed for an incineration in the Topf oven at Gusen was necessarily longer than for the Ignis-Hüttenbau oven. This difference is further accentuated by the fact that the Theresienstadt ovens had a more effective heating system and a technically more advanced design. From these considerations it becomes obvious that the minimum theoretical duration for the cremation, which I assigned to the Gusen oven – some 40 minutes – is certainly very optimistic.

The actual duration may well have been around 45 minutes.

Nevertheless, the exceptional results of the Gusen oven could not be achieved by the two-muffle ovens of Krema I at Auschwitz because the Gusen oven depended on two essential factors:

1. the particular structure of its muffle grill;
2. the use of forced draft blower.

10.2. The Muffle Grills of the Gusen Oven

The muffle grills in the Gusen oven consisted of intersecting bars, which formed eight rectangular openings of about 30 × 25 cm each. Hence the *principal combustion* of the corpses began in the muffles but developed for the most part underneath the muffle in the ash receptacle, so that the muffle was freed relatively quickly (after about 45 minutes) and it was possible to introduce another corpse.

The Auschwitz ovens, on the other hand, had a completely different muffle grill and were much less efficient. The two ovens of Krema I reconstructed after the war by the Poles utilizing original parts dismantled by the SS show a muffle grill made of I-shaped slabs of monolith arranged in a slot of grooves. Between them were gaps about five centimeters in width. With this type of grill, not only did the principal combustion have to take place in the muffle, but so did the post-combustion of corpse residues. For this reason, the duration of the process was necessarily longer.

The efficiency of these ovens can be seen from the following fact: On June 1, 1942, Bischoff wrote a letter to Kammler to inform him of the damage caused to the chimney of Krema I and he specified:[\[340\]](#)

“The chimney has suffered damages because of overheating due to continuous usage (operating day and night).”

Both Danuta Czech’s *Kalendarium* and Pressac exclude any connection between this breakdown and the cremation of corpses of presumed victims of gassings. Therefore, during May 1942 *only* the corpses of deceased detainees of the camp were cremated in the *Stammlager* crematorium.

On March 30, 1942, Bischoff was informed of the damage done to the chimney by SS-*Oberscharführer* Josef Pollock in his capacity as the officer in charge of police affairs concerned with construction,[\[341\]](#) so that the snag had manifested itself before this date. During the second half of the month the greatest mortality occurred in days 19 to 29, during which about 1,450 detainees died, 132 per day on average.

Bischoff's letter of June 28, 1943, attributes a cremation capacity of 340 corpses in 24 hours to the three two-muffle ovens of Krema I. This corresponds to an average duration of 25 minutes per cremation, which is practically the same as that erroneously supposed by Zimmerman. If this were true, then the ovens could have cremated the approximately 1,450 daily corpses mentioned above for the second half of May in a little over nine hours, that is, in a simple day shift. But since day and night operation of the ovens was necessary, their cremation capacity was notably lower. If we assume the normal duration for the process of cremation, the ovens were active for about 22 hours per day – exactly a day and night operation.

The other difference between the Gusen oven and those of Krema I of Auschwitz is that the Gusen forced draft system served two muffles, while in the Auschwitz crematorium it served six, so that the latter was less efficient. After the reconstruction of the chimney in August of 1942, the forced draft system was eliminated completely.

In a three-muffle oven, the muffle grill was made up of bars arranged transversally at a distance of about 20 cm from each other. The principal combustion developed in the muffle, and the corpse residues fell through the grill gaps into the ash pan where post-combustion took place (lasting some 20 minutes according to the service instructions of Topf). In addition, the Birkenau ovens functioned without an forced draft system.[\[342\]](#)

Therefore the cremation capacity of Krema I appearing in Bischoff's letter of June 28, 1943, has no real basis, and this is also valid for the Birkenau ovens, which were *less efficient* than the Gusen oven.

10.3. The Forced Draft System of the Gusen Oven

Zimmerman writes:

“However, he [Mattogno] did not cite any evidence to this effect nor did he provide evidence that the Gusen oven had any features that differed from the Auschwitz ovens. The cost sheets for the Gusen double muffle oven installed in October 1941 list no such item.”

This assertion is false. Invoice no. D 41/107, drawn up by Topf on February 5, 1941, lists the constituent elements of the oven, among which were:[\[343\]](#)

“collapsible chimney of 4 m height, forced draft installation.”

The delivery note of December 12, 1940, mentions among the “parts for the cremation oven”:[\[344\]](#)

“1 wagon for the blower station with three blowers.”

Of these 3 blowers one served for the two burners – because the original oven was planned to operate with naphtha, another for transporting combustion air into the muffles, the third for the forced draft installation (*Saugzuganlage*).

Zimmerman declares:

“At the time I wrote the body disposal study I did not have access to the full Topf file on the Gusen ovens. I only had a few documents from that file. Thanks to the efforts of Ulrich Roessler of The Holocaust History Project, I now have the complete file NS 4 Ma/54.”

So if Zimmerman possesses “the full file on the Gusen oven,” it is clear that his lie is deliberate.

And although he possessed the whole of this documentation, Zimmerman did not even manage to see that the Gusen oven was not “installed in October 1941” but in January. Its parts were shipped by Topf via rail-freight on December 12, 1940, and arrived at their destination on December 19. On the same day, the SS New Construction Office of Mauthausen camp sent Topf a telegram asking for the immediate dispatch of a technician.^[345] Topf decided to send their specialist August Willing for December 27.^[346] Work started the same day and ended on January 22, 1941. The two gasifiers for the coke were set up during the construction of the oven,^[347] which went into operation at the end of January.^[348]

11. The Expansion of the Birkenau Camp and the Necessity of the Crematoria

11.1. Origin of the Birkenau Crematoria

Zimmerman writes:

“In the study (Body, 12) I cited an article by camp historian Danuta Czech that the negotiations for the four crematoria began in July 1942, before the announcement of planned expansion to 200,000 on August 15.

Elsewhere, Czech cites a Bauleitung^[349] document from July 1, 1942 as follows:

‘The Central Construction Office of the Waffen SS and Police in Auschwitz contacts the companies that have already carried out building contracts in Auschwitz Concentration Camp. It asks the Huta (Engineering Company) and Lenz Industrial Construction Company of

Silesia, located in Kattowitz to submit proposals to build new crematoriums.’ (emphasis added)

Mattogno’s response is to cite the following Aktenvermerk of August 21, reproduced by Jean-Claude Pressac:

‘Regarding the construction of a 2nd crematorium with five three-muffle furnaces, together with the ventilation and air extraction systems, it will be necessary to await the results of negotiations already under way with the Reich Main Security Office on the subject of rationed materials’ (Italics added).

Mattogno then announces:

‘Therefore, no decision to construct Crematory II had yet been made (by August 21)’ (Reply, 7, emphasis added).

Before continuing, I need to strongly stress that nowhere in the body disposal study did I ever state the contract negotiations for any of the crematoria were completed or when any final decisions were made. I only stated, on the basis of Czech, when they began, and in a footnote, when the authorization was given to begin (Body, note 80).’’

Therefore, the entire argumentation is founded “on the basis of Czech.” Appropriate for a dilettante, Zimmerman trusts blindly in Danuta Czech, but his trust is very badly misplaced. In fact, the document in the *Kalendarium* of Auschwitz, which he cites,[\[350\]](#) refers only to Krema II. Franciszek Piper correctly summarizes it as follows:[\[351\]](#)

“With the completion of the first stage of planning on July 1, 1942, the Zentralbauleitung offered two construction firms, Huta Hoch- und Tiefbau AG and Schlesische Industriehaus^{[\[352\]](#)} und CO AG in Kattowitz, which had been cooperating with the camp for some time, to undertake the construction of the crematorium building (number II).’’ (my emphasis)

Zimmerman knows this article well since he cites it in note 14 of “Body Disposal.” Here then is a brilliant example of opportunistic misuse of the sources. Finding himself faced with two contradictory accounts of one document, he was totally uninterested in the original document and has obviously chosen the version that is most convenient for him! If Zimmerman still has any doubts in this regard, then let him get the original document from his mentor Ulrich Rössler and publish it!

That the offer of Central Construction Office referred only to the “Krematorium”[\[353\]](#) (singular!) of the POW camp (Birkenau) is evidenced by other documents, e.g. Bischoff’s letters of October 13, 1942,[\[354\]](#) and of

May 5, 1943.[355]

The fallacious summary of this document provided by D. Czech has a clear ideological-propagandistic motivation, as can be seen from what she writes in the essay, which Zimmerman invokes in “Body Disposal” (“Origins of the Camp, Its Construction and Expansion” published in the book “Auschwitz: Nazi Death Camp,” notes 80 and 52). Here in fact is what D. Czech wrote in her essay, according to the official Italian translation of this book:[356]

“At the end of July of the same year the Construction Office, which in the meantime had become the Central Construction Office of the Waffen SS and Police Auschwitz and which was responsible for construction work in the Auschwitz and Birkenau camps, started negotiations with various firms for the installation of not two, but of four large crematoria and their respective gas chambers.”[357] (my emphasis)

In passing I might indicate that it is stated clearly in this passage that already in July 1942 the Construction Office of Auschwitz had been promoted to *Central Construction Office*. Although I made specific reference to this passage from “Body Disposal”[358] (note 80), Zimmerman has continued to make the blunder of using the term *Bauleitung*. Another example of his superficiality and dilettantism.

The account of Danuta Czech on the “start” of negotiations for the presumed “new crematoriums” at the end of July 1942 being false, so is therefore the conclusion of Zimmerman. This conclusion is ultimately refuted by the “overview” by Bischoff of July 30, 1942, regarding ongoing and planned constructions, which were to be done in the third financial year of the war (“*die...im dritten Kriegswirtschaftsjahre zu errichten sind*”). Regarding the POW camp (Birkenau) it mentions only the item “*Krematorium*”[359] for the reason explained above. This means that even by July 30 no one planned to build the remaining three crematories. They were planned later.

11.2. The Strength of the Camp

Having determined that the decision to construct Kremas III, IV, and V was taken in August 1942, let us now see what the historical context was. I assert that this decision was taken as a consequence of two facts:

1. the expansion of the camp to a strength of 200,000 detainees;
2. the terrible typhus epidemic that raged in the camp.

The essential factor was therefore the mortality as a function of the camp's strength. As to point 1, Zimmerman writes in his response:

"My guess is that if Mattoigno had documentation for his assertion that the 200,000 was planned in July he would have cited it by now."

In his letter of August 3, 1942, addressed to the head of Office CV of WVHA, Bischoff writes:[\[360\]](#)

"Since the occupation has increased and various other aspects had to be taken into consideration, the enclosed situation plan no. 1453 from July 8, 1942, was compiled, which includes the following additional barracks:"

These supplementary barracks were: "24 accommodation barracks, 2 sickbay barracks, 1 storage barrack" for construction sector I and "36 accommodation barracks, 4 laundry barracks, 4 sickbay barracks" for each of the construction sectors II and III. Thus it lists 96 supplementary accommodation barracks for the plan of July 8. Bischoff adds:[\[361\]](#)

"The expansion of the planning was shown to Head of Office Group C SS-Brigadeführer and Major General of the Waffen-SS Dr. Ing. Kammler on the occasion of the Reichsführer's visit on July 17 and 18, 1942."

In this letter, written – I emphasize – on August 3, 1942, Bischoff goes on to write:

"Apart from that, the location for the new crematorium close to the quarantine camp was determined."

Therefore, still on August 3, 1942, the head of the Central Construction Office of Auschwitz knew of only one crematorium, that which would finally become Krema II.

11.3. What Camp Strength Was Anticipated?

As far as I know, no plan is known of July 8, 1942, but in his letter of June 29, 1942, to "Office C V" of the WVHA (that is, to Kammler) Bischoff writes:

"according to the order of Reichsführer SS and Chief of the German Police, the camp is to be expanded from 125,000 to 150,000 prisoners of war."

Therefore the plan of July 8 must have foreseen a strength of 150,000 detainees.

After his visit to Auschwitz on July 17 and 18, 1942, Himmler decided on a new "expansion" of the camp. For what strength? Dwork and van Pelt have

published the plan for a “accommodation barrack for a prisoner camp,” which carries a “capacity” of “app. 550 men.” This figure is cancelled by a pencil stroke and above it appears the hand-written numeral “744.”[\[362\]](#) Therefore the supplementary 96 barracks would have housed at least about $(96 \times 550 =)$ 52,800 detainees, which brought the camp strength to about 202,800 detainees when added to the 150,000 already projected.

But there is an even more explicit document. On August 27, 1942, Bischoff sent to head of Office CV of SS-WVHA a letter concerning “*Lageplan Kriegsgefangenenlager Auschwitz*” (lay-out plan of POW camp Auschwitz) in which he said:[\[363\]](#)

“In the lay-out plan attached, the enlargement of the POW camp to a capacity of 200,000 men, as recently requested, has already been incorporated.”

The letter referred to a memo from Office CV dated August 10. The new “*Lageplan*” mentioned in the document is the one dated August 15, 1942, which planned precisely for a capacity of 200,000 detainees.[\[364\]](#)

Thus the first point of my thesis has been proved. Let us consider the second. August 1942 proved to be the month of the highest mortality in the entire history of the Auschwitz camp. During the whole month around 8,600 detainees died,[\[365\]](#) nearly double the mortality for July (about 4,400 deaths). The first indication of a decision to build the remaining three crematoria goes back to August 14 (the date on which plan 1678 for Kremas IV/V was worked out). By the end of August 13, another 2,500 detainees had died, giving an average mortality of over 190 deaths per day. From August 14 to 19 (the day on which the discussions summarized in the file memo of August 21 were reported) the mortality became even higher: about 2,400 deaths, on average about 400 per day. The peak occurred on August 19, when more than 500 deaths were confirmed. On August 1 the male strength of the camp was 21,421 detainees. 4,113 detainees had died by the end of August 19, on average 216 deaths per day, of which 1,675 occurred from August 14 to 19, on average 279 per day. The average strength of the camp between August 1 and 19 was about 22,900 detainees.

What would have happened if another typhus epidemic had broken out in a camp with 200,000 detainees?

The explanation for constructing more crematoria is all here.

11.4. The Typhus “Myth”

Zimmerman has the impudence to head one of the paragraphs of his ponderings “The Typhus Myth” (“Body Disposal”). This “myth” would be proved by death certificates presently available. Referring to these in “Body Disposal,” Zimmerman writes:

“It is known on the basis of these certificates that very few prisoners died from typhus. They show that only 2,060 of the 68,864 deaths were from typhus.”

He then finds that in these certificates many of the causes of death are abnormal or false and concludes:

“How then can the death certificates be explained if the stated causes do not conform to physical reality? The only explanation is that the camp authorities were engaged in a massive killing campaign of registered prisoners. Part of this has to do with typhus.”

In “My Response” Zimmerman explains:

“that most of the sick prisoners were being murdered en masse in Auschwitz because it was easier to kill them than to hospitalize them.”

So if I understand him well, “most of the sick” from typhus were killed. In how many cases of the death certificates is it that the “stated causes do not conform to physical reality?” Zimmerman mentions two of them:

“In some cases children were said have died from ‘decrepitude,’ an affliction of the aged.”

In reality, Zimmerman’s source[\[366\]](#) mentions *a single case* of this kind among 68,864! How can it seriously be claimed that this case is an intentional falsification and not a simple error? Were the SS doctors truly such idiots? Let us consider the second case referred to by Zimmerman:

“Kielar’s description is borne out by the death certificates of 168 prisoners who were shot on May 27, 1942 but whose cause of death was listed as ‘heart attack.’”

Thus, at the maximum, we have 169 documented causes of death, 169 among 68,864, that is 0.2%. And this would be the proof of the alleged mass falsification of causes of death in the certificates?

The falsification of these 169 causes of death is not explainable by the hypothesis that a mass extermination of sick detainees was going on at Auschwitz – according to the official historiography these detainees were “gassed” and not shot – but by the fact of the abuses committed by the head of the Political Section, Maximilian Grabner, who was accused by SS judge Konrad Morgen of having arbitrarily killed 2,000 detainees.[\[367\]](#) It is

therefore probable that, earlier on, some complaisant camp physician had been willing to cover Grabner's crimes by falsifying the death certificates of detainees illegally shot by Grabner. These falsifications, though, demonstrate the very opposite of what Zimmerman asserts, because here we do not have a change of "gassing" to "shooting" for the cause of death, but rather of "shooting" to "heart attack." These falsifications did not cover up a mass extermination by means of gas, they covered up shootings which, being hushed up in this way, were illegal and arbitrary. Had a mass extermination been going on at that time by orders from higher up, there would not have been a need to hide these mass shootings.

Zimmerman asserts that during the typhus epidemic the sick detainees were killed *en mass*. Let us see what happened during the month when the typhus epidemic reached its peak: August 1942.

From a "Holocaust" angle, a "selection" for "gassing" exists only if it is attested to by documents or by testimony. If both are missing, such gassings did not occur. In her *Kalendarium*, Danuta Czech diligently collected and recorded all the documentation which shows, in her opinion, individual "selections." In the *Kalendarium* three "selections" appear for August 1942:

- August 3: 193 "gassed"
- August 10: an indeterminate number of "gassed"
- August 29: 746 "gassed."

We can say that the round figure is 1,500 "gassed." All other deaths were therefore due to "natural" causes. But in August 1942 there were 8,600 deaths overall, of which 7,100 were due to "natural" causes even according to Czech. What caused this extremely high mortality if it was not typhus? As we see, this "myth" is truly fatal.

As to the reason for the small number of causes of death documented in the death books related to typhus, I fully maintain everything I wrote in point 39 of my "Observations," which is that deaths of sick persons from typhus could have been due to complications arising from a general prostration of their physique and weakening of their immune system, aggravated by the scarcity of medication. I can cite a document, the "Notes on the treatment with preparation 3582/IGF/ against typhus," to confirm this. At the beginning of February 1943, an experiment at Auschwitz with a new drug against typhus was carried out on 50 detainees affected with this disease, 15 of whom died during the treatment or immediately after it stopped. The note points out:

[\[368\]](#)

“Of the 15 deceased death occurred: 6 due to weakening of the heart, 6 due to toxic cachexia, 2 due to brain complications (encephalitis), 1 due to resulting fever, the origin of which could not be determined.”

So none of these 15 detainees died from typhus, but that illness was nonetheless the indirect cause of their death.

12. Connection between Camp Strength and Number of Crematory Ovens

12.1. The Example of Dachau

Zimmerman writes:

“The most informative comparison of oven needs versus camp expansion comes from the Dachau concentration camp. Dachau had six ovens. A total of 22,675 prisoners arrived at Dachau in 1940; 6,255 in 1941, 12,572 in 1942, 19,358 in 1943 and over 76,000 in 1944. Therefore, the prisoner population of the camp had reached over 41,000 by the end of 1942, over 60,000 by the end of 1943 and over 137,000 by the end of 1944. By contrast, the registered Auschwitz camp population never reached more than 92,000 – 112,000, if 20,000 transit prisoners to be shipped to other camps are counted in the summer of 1944. Moreover, there were typhus epidemics in Dachau in the winters of 1942-43 and 1943-44. Therefore, Dachau should have undergone a dramatic expansion of its cremation capacity, if the ‘denier’ arguments about Auschwitz are correct. Thus, at a time of typhus epidemics and a doubling of Dachau’s camp population, there were never more than six ovens. Why did Auschwitz need 52 ovens and Dachau only six?”

Zimmerman begins with the usual imposture in that he peddles “the prisoner population of the camp” for those who were *transported* to the camp. This can be seen from an official publication of the Dachau Museum, [\[369\]](#) which gives the following figures:

1940:	22,675		1943:	19,358
1941:	6,135		1944:	78,635
1942:	12,572			

The camp population was much lower than what Zimmerman claims. The real numbers are as follows:[\[370\]](#)

Period	Real	Fictitious	Excess
--------	------	------------	--------

	strength	strength	
December 1942	14,000	41,000	27,000
August 1943	17,000	60,000 (to December)	43,000
December 1944	47,000	137,000	90,000
		Total:	160,000

So with this imposture Zimmerman increases the strength of Dachau by 160,000 detainees, who for the most part had been transferred to other camps.

Similarly with another imposture he reduces to 92,000 – or 112,000 counting the Jewish detainees of the transit camp – the maximum strength of the Auschwitz camp, which “in the summer of 1944” reached 105,168 detainees – or 135,168 counting the 30,000 Jewish detainees of the transit camp.[\[371\]](#)

Let us now see what the confirmed mortality was at Dachau as a result of the camp’s expansion and the typhus epidemics of 1940 to 1944:[\[372\]](#)

YEAR:	1940		1941		1942	
MONTH	DEATHS	PER DAY	DEATHS	PER DAY	DEATHS	PER DAY
January	/	/	455	14.6	142	4.5
February	17	0.5	393	14	104	3.7
March	86	2.7	321	10.3	66	2.1
April	101	3.3	227	7.5	79	2.6
May	87	2.8	322	10.3	98	3.1
June	54	1.8	219	7.3	84	2.8
July	34	1.1	140	4.5	173	5.5
August	119	3.8	104	3.3	454	14.6
September	134	4.4	73	2.4	319	10.6
October	171	5.5	88	2.8	207	6.6
November	273	9.1	110	3.5	380	12.6
December	439	14.1	124	4	364	11.7
Total	1,515	4.1	2,576	7	2,470	6.7

YEAR:	1943		1944	
MONTH	DEATHS	PER DAY	DEATHS	PER DAY

January	205	6.6	53	1.7
February	221	7.8	101	3.4
March	139	4.4	362	11.6
April	112	3.7	144	4.8
May	83	2.6	84	2.7
July	55	1.8	78	2.6
July	51	1.6	107	3.4
August	40	1.2	225	7.2
September	45	1.5	325	10.8
October	57	1.8	403	13
November	43	1.4	997	33.2
December	49	1.5	1,915	61.7
Total	1,100	3	4,794	13.1

Therefore, “at a time of typhus epidemics,” during the winters of 1942-1943 and 1943-1944, the detainee mortality was effectively highest: a good nine per day during the first typhus wave and 42 during the second! Excluding the last two months of 1944, when conditions in the camp started to become tragic, the highest mortality was confirmed in January 1941, with 455 deaths, on average 14.6 per day. Of course, this needed a “dramatic (!) expansion” of the crematory capacity of the Topf two-muffle coke oven in the camp’s old crematorium!

Like the Gusen oven, this installation was originally a naphtha-heated oven, which was transformed into a coke oven by the addition of two lateral gas generators. Thus the cremation capacity of this oven must have been the same as that of the Gusen oven. Zimmerman’s claim is therefore even more ridiculous in that he attributes to this oven – and consequently to the Dachau oven – a cremation capacity of 4.7 corpses per hour (two every 25.2 minutes!), 47 in 10 hours, 94 in 20 hours.

What then would have been the use of another crematory oven?

Yet, in spite of this, a new crematorium was constructed at Dachau (the “Barrack X”), in which four Kori single-muffle coke-heated ovens were installed. The cost estimate for the installation bears the date March 17, 1942, [\[373\]](#) a period during which the mortality was lowest: two deaths per day. The plan of the ovens was completed by the Kori firm on May 12, 1942, [\[374\]](#) but it seems that the installation went into service only in the spring of 1943. [\[375\]](#) Nevertheless, during this period – from March 1942 to May 1943 – the camp had an average mortality of barely three deaths per day.

Thus the argument turns against Zimmerman. As another four ovens were constructed when the mortality was so low, and if the existing two-muffle oven was more than sufficient, what was the need to install more ovens?

12.2. The Example of Gusen

Zimmerman writes:

“In the body disposal study I cited data from Gusen. Let us now look at the Gusen data and Mattoigno’s response. In 1944 Gusen expanded from two to three camps, but did not add any ovens. Figures for Gusen show that 14,500 entered the camp in 1940 and 1941, 6,000 in 1942, 9,100 in 1943, 22,300 in 1944 and 15,600 in 1945. Death rates from 1940 to 1945 were very high. From 1940 to 1944 slightly less than 25,000 of the 52,000 prisoners who entered the camp died. The population of the camp exceeded 22,000 by September 1944. Yet there was never more than one double muffle oven in Gusen. As noted earlier, the Mauthausen authorities ordered another double muffle for Gusen, but never installed it.”

Therefore, why were more ovens not installed at Gusen as a result of the camp’s expansion?

First of all, let us see the picture of the mortality at this camp. I give the relevant data in the tables which follow:[\[376\]](#)

YEAR:	1941		1942		1943		1944	
MONTH	DEATHS	PER DAY	DEATHS	PER DAY	DEATHS	PER DAY	DEATHS	PER DAY
January	220	7	1,303	42	1,436	46	311	10
February	250	9	497	18	696	25	167	6
March	375	12	751	24	546	18	212	7
April	380	13	211	7	867	29	145	5
May	239	8	93	3	268	9	85	3
June	199	7	135	5	167	6	203	7
July	369	12	558	18	180	6	192	6
August	479	15	562	18	164	5	242	8
September	426	14	374	12	192	6	168	6
October	462	15	655	21	154	5	429	14
November	887	30	552	18	250	8	943	31
December	986	32	1,719	55	328	11	994	32
Total	5,272	14	7,410	20	5,248	14	4,091	11

Hence the average mortality for these four years was about 15 deaths a

day. The highest mortality occurs in January 1943, with an average of 46 deaths per day. With a forced draft blower the Gusen oven could cremate two corpses in around 40 minutes (one in each muffle), so that it handled the mortality peak with about 15 hours of operation. In accordance with the average mortality, it operated daily for about five hours, for six if we include one hour for heating it up.

What was the need for another oven?

12.3. The Example of Buchenwald

I showed the captious nature of Zimmerman's methods in point 38 of my "Observations." For comparison with Auschwitz, he chose two examples which he naively thought favored his thesis: Dachau and Gusen, examined above. I objected that the case of Buchenwald completely invalidated his thesis. Zimmerman claims that in this area I kept silent on "some crucial information." This is what he wrote in "My Response" on this matter:

"Not surprisingly, Mattogno did not reveal some crucial information about the installation of the additional six ovens in Buchenwald. Shortly after the installation of these ovens the camp began to undergo a dramatic expansion in its population. It rose from 9,500 at the end of 1942 to over 37,000 by the end of 1943. Buchenwald continued to grow until by September 1944 it held over 84,000 prisoners. Seen in light of the actual growth of the camp, the new six ovens were not unusual. The Buchenwald authorities certainly must have anticipated this growth when the oven additions were made."

It is true that on December 31, 1943, the average strength of the camp was 37,319 detainees, but it is also true that the two ovens came into operation on August 23 and October 3, 1942, respectively.[\[377\]](#) An event occurring after 14 months cannot really be said to have taken place "shortly after!" But let us overlook this. If the first of the two ovens went into operation on August 23, 1942, the decision to construct them was taken at the latest in the spring of 1942.

According to the statistics of the sick bay, the actual situation at the time was as follows:[\[378\]](#)

Period	Average strength	Mortality	Daily mortality
March 30 – May 2	6,653	337	9.9

May 3 – May 31	6,600	243	8.3
June 1 – June 28	7,828	231	8.2
June 29 – August 2	8,394	331	9.4
August 3 – August 30	9,461	335	11.9

The average strength of the camp was kept stable at around 9,000 detainees until January 1943, then it began to continuously rise as in the following table:[\[379\]](#)

Month	Strength	Month	Strength
January	9,719	July	16,500
February	11,513	August	18,500
March	12,526	September	22,736
April	13,186	October	27,736
May	14,503	November	33,379
June	14,741	December	36,103

Here, as in the examples of Dachau and Gusen, Zimmerman has slyly diverted the discussion to the camp strength, as though I had considered it the *only* factor, which led to the decision to construct another three crematoria at Birkenau. In actual fact, I consider the essential factor to be the mortality (caused mainly by the typhus epidemic) *as a function* of the camp strength.

Although the average strength of Buchenwald in 1943 was about 19,300 detainees, that is, it increased by 232% with respect to the average strength for 1942 (about 8,300 detainees), the mortality increased by hardly 43% (from 2,542 deaths in 1942 to 3,636 in 1943) and the average daily mortality was hardly 10 deaths.

Zimmerman argues retrospectively, as though the Central Construction Office of Weimar-Buchenwald was planning this expansion before August 1942, but his statement is “without any proof.” With typical Pharisaic hypocrisy, our professor has the impudence to throw in my face the statement that the decision to expand the strength of Auschwitz-Birkenau to 200,000 detainees was taken in July 1942, claiming it is “without any proof,” and he hurls the same rebuke at Pressac, that he too is guilty of having made a statement “without any proof.” One more example of the squalid opportunism of this individual.

Nevertheless, *let us suppose* that Zimmerman’s statement was perfectly documented. In that case the Central Construction Office of Weimar-

Buchenwald would have decided on the construction of two three-muffle ovens in anticipation not only of the camp's expansion but also of a mortality in proportion to its strength.

On account of transports of evacuees from other camps, the Buchenwald camp reached its maximum strength of 85,900 detainees in October 1944. It certainly cannot be seriously maintained that in 1942 the Central Construction Office of Weimar-Buchenwald had predicted this increase in the camp's strength because at the time it would have foreseen the defeat of Germany.

Nevertheless, granted for the sake of the argument that the phantom plan of spring 1942 for the camp's expansion really concerned this strength of 85,400 prisoners, on the grounds of the experience of the first six months of 1942, during which there were 1,310 deaths among an average population of 7,400 detainees (around 7 deaths a day). Then the plan could also have foreseen the average mortality of about $(85,400 \div 7,400 \times 7 =)$ 81 deaths daily.

But then of what use would six muffles have been, which – according to Zimmerman – could cremate from 342 (one cremation in 25.2 minutes) to 576 (one cremation in 15 minutes) corpses in 24 hours?

Therefore, even if we assume the most absurd hypotheses favoring Zimmerman's thesis, the conclusions which follow radically contradict it.

Let us pass from hypotheses to reality. The two Buchenwald ovens were ordered and installed during a period when for months the mortality oscillated between eight and twelve deaths per day. So, using Zimmerman's argument based on real data, since the cremation capacity of the new installations was 120 corpses in 20 hours, that is, 3,600 per month, in two months they could have devoured the entire camp population! On the other hand, since this real capacity was at least ten times more than the above maximum mortality, it follows that the ovens had a criminal purpose and served to cremate the corpses of mass extermination!

The problem with that, of course, is that not even Zimmerman claims that there ever was a mass extermination in Buchenwald.

12.4. The Case of Auschwitz

In March 1942, 66 detainees died at Dachau, which had an average daily mortality of 14 deaths during the previous year. Despite this, the Munich Central Construction Office made plans for a new crematorium with four ovens.

At Buchenwald the average mortality was 8-12 deaths per day, and in spite of this the Central Construction Office of Weimar-Buchenwald planned and had installed two three-muffle ovens.

In addition to the 15 muffles planned for crematory II, how many muffles should the Central Construction Office have planned for Auschwitz, where in August 1942 the average daily mortality was 277 deaths? Let us make some quick calculations:

	Dachau	Buchenwald	Auschwitz
Mortality in month, during which the new ovens were planned	66	337	8,600
Number of planned new muffles	4	6	31 [380]

Therefore, the number of new muffles at Auschwitz was 5.1 times more than that of Buchenwald and 7.7 more than that of Dachau, whereas the mortality was respectively 25.5 and 130 times more. Had the Central Construction Office of Auschwitz adopted the same criterion as that chosen by the Central Construction Office of Weimar-Buchenwald, for instance, the former would have planned an installation with $(8,600 \div 337 \times 6 =)$ 153 muffles!

12.5. The “Static” Population of Auschwitz

Zimmerman finds in “Body Disposal”:

“More importantly, I also noted that during the period of the typhus epidemic when the camp experienced its highest death rate for registered prisoners, the camp population remained static at about 30,000. I cited a Bauleitung report dated July 15, 1942 – twelve days after the typhus epidemic hit the camp – which stated that for the time being the camp population would remain at 30,000.”

Nowhere does Zimmerman mention the source of this document. Never mind! The number 30,000 of detainees appears in two reports of Bischoff of July 15, 1942:

“Explanatory Report on the temp. expansion of the concentration camp Auschwitz O/S,”[\[381\]](#)

and

“Explanatory Report on construction project concentration camp

Auschwitz O/S.”[382]

However, in neither is it stated that “the camp population remained static at about 30,000.” In the “*Dienstliche Veranlassung*” (official inducement), which appears on page two of the first document, one reads:[383]

“According to the order of Reichsführers-SS and Chief of the German Police, a concentration camp for at present 30,000 inmates is to be established on the grounds of a former Polish artillery barracks in Auschwitz O/S.”

The same sentence is repeated in the official inducement on p. 2 of the second document, with the addition:

“simultaneously agricultural enterprises are to be established.”

Both documents refer exclusively to the main camp (*Stammlager*). So as usual, our naïve professor has understood nothing. In the case at hand, I do not even believe that he is trying to deceive us on purpose, since he does not give the source of the document he cites. It is clear that he puts his trust in second-hand or third-hand sources. So here he only provides additional proof of his crass ignorance and dilettantism.

13. Open Air Incinerations

13.1. Air Photo of May 31, 1944

Zimmerman writes:

“In my disposal study I had supposed that Mattogno received any information he had about this topic from John Ball. In the article Mattogno wrote with Franco Deana he had twice referred his readers to an article by Ball when discussing the grave sites in the area outside of the camp that appear on the May 31 photo. He wrote: ‘John Ball demonstrates in the present volume that air photos taken of Auschwitz by the Allies show no traces of incineration in pits.’

I was able to show that Ball has lied consistently about these photos. Mattogno now states (Reply, 3) that he possesses all of the aerial and surface photographs of Auschwitz from 1944. This is quite a revelation since he has given no less than three different versions of what is on this photo. Mattogno writes that ‘if I change opinion concerning interpretation of specific points, that depends only upon progression of my studies, and not due to the fact that later books have published documents which I have

already possessed' (Reply, 3). But since he already had these photos, one wonders what could have changed on them to give varying accounts of their contents. Did he actually examine them or did he rely on Ball? I strongly suspect that Mattogno was deceived by Ball but is now too embarrassed to admit."

I respond briefly.

1. I am in possession of the air photos of Auschwitz-Birkenau since 1989-1990. If Zimmerman doesn't believe it, that's his affair. If he is curious, let him ask his compatriots near the National Archives, Washington D.C., to check the "Orders for Reproduction Services" starting from 1989.
2. I am not an expert on aerial photogrammetry, neither have I ever said I was one, nor do I have the technical instruments to attempt an analysis of this kind.
3. The photographs are in black and white and it is not easy with the naked eye to distinguish extremely small objects, especially if there is vegetation round about. However this may be, it is a fact that Zimmerman's expert, Mr. Carroll Lucas, "a photo imagery expert with 45 years experience" ("Body Disposal"), speaks of "'possible' lines of people moving between the open hand dug trenches toward Crematorium V" ("Body Disposal") in his "report." Hence, in spite of his 45 years of experience, in spite of his sophisticated technical instruments, he has not been able to establish with certainty what these "lines" are.
4. In my analysis of the document I was partially misled by "eyewitness" testimony, like that of Nyiszli, invoked by Zimmerman in "Body Disposal." Referring to the period of "extermination" of the Hungarian Jews, Nyiszli wrote:[\[384\]](#)

"We set off in the direction of the thick twisting spiral of smoke. All those unfortunate enough to be brought here saw this column of smoke, which was visible from any point in the KZ, from the moment they first descended from the box cars and lined up for selection. It was visible at every hour of the day and night. By day it covered the sky above Birkenau with a thick cloud; by night it lighted the area with a hellish glow." (my emphasis)

If one considers that the Birkenau camp measured 1,657.01 m × 720 m, the photographs should have showed more than a square kilometer covered with smoke!

In order to have an objective point of reference, I compared the

photographs of May 31 with the one of September 13, in which clouds of smoke caused by bomb explosions were perfectly recognizable. Nothing like this, however, appeared in the photographs of May 31, so that I concluded that they showed no trace of smoke.

5. My reference to John Ball cited by Zimmerman appears in the German work *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte* (1994), which also includes an article by John Ball on air photos. On page 247 one reads:

“Only on the exposure of Mai 31, 1944, one can see a small smoke plume acceding from behind crematorium V.”

Therefore, John Ball contradicted my assertion. Owing to the subsequent debate and thanks to the analysis of considerable enlargements of the above photographs, I became convinced that John Ball was correct on this score.

5. In contrast to Zimmerman, who recognized his numerous “errors” only after my tight criticism, I recognized my own spontaneously and corrected it. No Zimmerman forced me to do it. And no Zimmerman forced me to make the corrections that I mentioned in the “Author’s Note” appearing in the introduction to the English translation of the *Grundlagen* article.[\[385\]](#) This demonstrates that my revisions are a result of ongoing progress made in my studies on the question.

13.2. “Trash Incineration”?

In “Body Disposal” Zimmerman wrote:

“Mattoigno claimed in 1995, the year following the publication of the May 31 photo, that the smoke was not from burning but most probably from trash.”

I retorted that “I have never written anything like this, neither in this booklet nor elsewhere” (“Observations,” point 1). The booklet I refer to is my article *Auschwitz Holocaust revisionist Jean-Claude Pressac. The “Gassed” People of Auschwitz: Pressac’s New revisions*, published by Russ Granata in 1995 precisely as a booklet. In “My Response” Zimmerman quotes the following sentence taken from the *online* version of the above article:

“The small column of smoke rising from the courtyard near Crematory V which appears in the aerial photograph is consistent with outside trash incineration.”

I confirm once more what I said: I never wrote – and can add, never thought of writing – such a thing. This sentence in question was inserted by

the editor of the *online* version without my knowledge. In fact, the sentence does not appear in the original version of the article, which is in the above booklet, two editions of which were published by Russ Granata. Moreover, I was perfectly aware of the existence of the two waste incineration ovens in crematoria II and III.

13.3. Activity or Inactivity of the Crematory Ovens?

In the controversy with Prof. Cajani on the interpretation of one of the May 31, 1944, air photos I wrote in *My Banned Holocaust Interview*:[\[386\]](#)

“The fact that smoke appears only in the courtyard of Crematorium V, and not from the crematoria chimneys, supposing that the smoke comes from a cremation facility, means only that this was the only facility then in operation; it is possible that they had recourse to such a facility when there was a shortfall in coke for the crematory ovens or when the crematoria were shut down for repairs.

*Danuta Czech writes in her *Kalendarium* that corpses of Gypsies alleged to have been homicidally gassed on 2 August 1944, were cremated out in the open because the crematory ovens at that time were not working (‘Denn die Krematoriumsöfen sind zu der Zeit nicht in Betrieb’)*”

Zimmerman trims this passage in such a way that “it is possible,” becomes a certainty. To prevent the reader from confirming this, he cites neither the page nor the title of my booklet, which he simply calls “the 1996 tract” (p. 5). On the previous page he mentions “a publication entitled *My Banned Holocaust Interview*” without supplying any information, not even the 1996 date of its publication, even though it is “very difficult to obtain.”[\[387\]](#) So Zimmerman’s reader cannot know what this “1996 tract” is!

To my hypothesis on open air burning on account of the crematoria being out of service, he counters me with two opposing objections. The first refers to the *Kalendarium* of Auschwitz. Zimmerman rebukes me for not having mentioned the source of Danuta Czech! This rebuke is rather hypocritical since Zimmerman, like everybody else, cites the page of the *Kalendarium* without mentioning her source, because the *Kalendarium* itself is considered to be a source!

The second objection is this:

“However, he could cite no sources which mention any oven failures during the Hungarian operation from mid May to mid July 1944.”

I will satisfy him at once. Here is the list of jobs drawn up for the

locksmith shop in the period under consideration:[388]

“13.4 1944. Nr. 1483. Krematorium-Verwaltung. Przedmiot [object]: *Instandsetzung von 20 Ofentüren u. 10. Kratzern in den Krematorien I und II [...]. Ukonczono [finishing]: 17.10 1944.*”

“1.6 1944. Nr. 1600. Krematorium-Verwaltung. Przedmiot: *Instandsetzung von 30 Ofentüren der Krematorien III und IV, sowie Anfertigung von 4 Stück Feuerhaken [...]. Ukonczono: 7.6 1944.*”

“7.6 1944. Nr. 1617. Krematorium-Verwaltung. Przedmiot: *Lfd. anfallende Reparaturen in den Krematorien 1–4 vom 8.6 – 20.7 44. Ukonczono: 4.7 1944.*”[389]

The order no. 1617 refers to the order of the *SS-Standortverwaltung* no. 337/4 of May 31, 1944, which means that the damage to be repaired occurred before this date.

In fact, at the beginning of May 1944, the masonry of the smoke flue and chimney of the crematories of Birkenau was again damaged, because on May 9, the head of the Central Construction Office of the Birkenau camp asked the camp commandant for a “permission to enter the crematoria I-IV” for the Koehler Firm,[390] because it had been “commissioned to make urgent maintenance works at the crematoria.”[391]

It has therefore been *proved by the documents* that the four Birkenau crematoria were undergoing repairs on May 31, 1944.

13.4. A Final Observation

In “My Response” Zimmerman writes:

“Another piece of evidence that the ovens were functioning is a reference in a camp document dated June 1, 1944 – one day after the May photo was taken – to the production of four pieces of firehooks (feuerhaken) [sic!] for 30 ovens. Why have such devices for ovens that were not working?”

By transforming the “repair of 30 oven doors” into “production of four pieces of firehooks for 30 ovens” our professor falsifies the document’s text, which is the order no. 1600 of June 1, 1944, cited above by me. Another example of Zimmerman’s deliberate deceit. Even though he has access to the documents, which prove that the crematoria were undergoing repairs, he not only fails to mention this, but falsifies the documents in order to prove the contrary!

The impudence of this imposter is truly incredible! And with self-

righteous hypocrisy he accuses me of saying nothing about compromising documents!

13.5. The Absence of Smoke from the Crematory Chimneys

Since the Birkenau ovens lacked recuperators preheating the combustion air up to 600°C, the ovens inevitably produced more smoke than the civilian ovens. This is revealed in the first place by Prüfer's statement cited above and which I wish to repeat here:

“Normal crematoria work with pre-warmed air so that the corpse burns quickly and without smoke. As the crematoria in the concentration camps were constructed differently, this procedure could not be used. The corpses burned more slowly and created more smoke, necessitating ventilation.”

In the second place, smoke was a drawback which beset even the most sophisticated civilian crematory ovens. Furthermore, in 1944 engineer Hans Keller conducted a series of experiments to find out what caused the formation of smoke.[\[392\]](#)

That the crematory chimneys of Birkenau smoked emerges from the photographs published by J.-C. Pressac's first work on Auschwitz²⁵ on pp. 340f. This is how he comments on photograph 17:

“South/north view of the greater part of the south side of Krematorium II, probably taken in summer 1943. [...] The Krematorium had already been at work, as we can see by the soot at the top of the chimney.”

In fact, the extremity of the chimney appears strongly blackened by soot, which becomes even more evident by contrast with the photograph 17a published alongside it, in which the extremity of the chimney is still clean.

From the large *external* soot deposits from the ovens' eight smoke conduits at an elevation of over 15 meters we deduce that when the ovens were in operation the chimney not only smoked, but it smoked *heavily*.

The definitive and irrefutable proof of the fact that the chimneys of the crematoria smoked when the ovens were in operation is furnished by the air photo of Birkenau taken on August 20, 1944 – one of the images in my album, which Zimmerman claims I do not possess![\[393\]](#)

Nevertheless, in the air photos of May 31, 1944, none of the six chimneys of the Birkenau crematoria are smoking. This confirms that the crematories of

Birkenau were out of service and that for this reason the corpses of the registered detainees were cremated in the open.

13.6. Mass Cremations?

In the first version of this article I had challenged Zimmerman – who had invoked two alleged experts of aerial photogrammetry, Mark van Alstine and Carroll Lucas – to publish not only their “discoveries” but also the respective air photos with precise indications of these “discoveries.” In his book *Holocaust Denial* already mentioned, Zimmerman has come back to the “discoveries” of his alleged experts, but obviously without publishing any air photos.

In a specific study[\[394\]](#) I have radically refuted the fanciful findings of those two experts by means of 48 documents, among which there are numerous air photos and their respective enlargements. Here, I will limit myself to some general observations.

In “Body Disposal” Zimmerman reported the findings of another expert, Mark van Alstine:

“He has identified three burning pits in the area of the White Bunker (Mattoigno states that there were four).[\[395\]](#)¹ Van Alstine is able to confirm from the photograph the existence of three huts that were used for prisoner undressing near the White Bunker. [...] Van Alstine also confirms the existence of three pits near Krema V each of which he estimates to be about 1,150 square feet for a total of 3,450 feet of pit space.”

This claim is completely wrong, as I documented in my study mentioned above.

It is known that the Soviets found only a basin with a surface area of 30 square meters during an on-site investigation of the region of Bunker 2 made a few months after the alleged events.[\[396\]](#) What kind of honesty or competence our expert has, can be deduced from this alone! As to the “three pits near Krema V,” I accept for the sake of the argument that they entail three pits each of about 106 m². Filip Müller states:[\[397\]](#)

“On order of Moll five pits were soon started to be dug behind crematorium V, not far away from the three gas chambers.”

As it issues from what he writes on p. 198, the order was given at the beginning of March 1944. The first two pits:[\[398\]](#)

“were 40 to 50 meters long, about 8 meters wide and 2 meters deep.”

“In the middle of May 1944,” F. Müller continues, the transports of Hungarian Jews began arriving; consequently:[399]

“Moll had three more incineration pits dug out in the courtyard behind crematorium V, so that he now had five of them there. Even the farmhouse west of crematoria IV and V, which served already in 1942 as an extermination site, had been brought back to an operational condition as so-called Bunker V. In addition to the four rooms of this house, which served as gas chambers, four incineration pits had been dug out.”

So, according to Filip Müller, on May 31, 1944, in the courtyard of Krema V there were five “cremation pits,” two of which each had minimum dimensions of $40\text{ m} \times 8\text{ m} = 320\text{ m}^2$ and four “cremation pits” of unknown size in the region of so-called *Bunker 2*. Van Alstine claims to have noted *three* – and not four – pits in this area, and *three* – not five – pits in the region of Krema V, with a *comprehensive* area equal to that of *only one* of F. Müller’s five pits! As we see, Van Alstine has solidly “confirmed” the trustworthiness of this “eyewitness!”

Among other things, I trustingly expect that Zimmerman’s “experts” will indicate in any air photo the exact location of the “area of some 60 meters length and 15 meters width,” which Moll ordered “concreted” “next to the pits at the crematorium.”[400] The thing should be extremely easy, given that we are dealing with an area *larger* than that of Krema V!

But let us proceed. By maintaining with authority that “at least 75%” of the 400,000 Hungarian Jews allegedly gassed “were burned in the open” (p. 18), Zimmerman deludes himself in challenging my conclusions on cremation at Auschwitz. In his judgment:

“An Auschwitz-Birkenau oven had the capacity to burn between 10,000 and 15,000 bodies. Since the Krema IV ovens went down shortly after being placed in operation, the 44 remaining ovens probably burned about half of the 1.1 million killed in the camp.

This estimate is based on the information available on the Gusen ovens after their overhaul in 1941, the Enek-Tek II data cited by Mattogno, the multiple cremation testimony I cited by Sonderkommando Henryk Tauber – who noted that the authorities had ways to place the bodies in the ovens to maximize efficiency (Body, 28) – and the method of burning in 25 minutes, instead of the usual 50 or 60 minutes, mentioned earlier in this response.”

The ignorance of this inexperienced person is truly unbelievable. Such an

“expert” on the crematory ovens of Auschwitz does not even know that Krema I, with its six muffles, ceased activity in July 1943. That is why the number of available muffles in 1944 was 38, not 44.

Finally, I note that the “estimate” of 75% of the 400,000 allegedly gassed Hungarian Jews – that is, “at least” 300,000 corpses cremated in the open – is not based on anything. It concerns the arbitrary number chosen by Zimmerman to balance his calculations. We will see shortly how reliable this number is.

For an “estimate” of the durability of the refractory masonry of “an Auschwitz-Birkenau oven” (without any distinction between ovens with 2, 3, or 8 muffles, which is totally ignored by Zimmerman), he gives 10,000 to 15,000 cremations! As demonstrated above I note that the information “available on the Gusen ovens” is false and arbitrary. The “Enek-Tek II data”[\[401\]](#) refers to an ultramodern gas oven of the 1980s, which can be applied to a coke oven of the forties only by a delusional standard of judgment. If a Ferrari F 2000 can attain a maximum speed of 360 km/h, then a Ferrari of the 1940s necessarily had a lower maximum speed. But Zimmerman uses such facts in an inverted sense: If a Ferrari F 2000 can reach a maximum speed of 360 km/h, so can a Ferrari of the 1940s. This logic is simply ridiculous.

Multiple cremations “attested to” by Tauber are technically impossible and are also refuted by Kurt Prüfer. The cremation in 25.2 minutes is based on an erroneous interpretation of the list of cremations at Gusen, hence does not have the least reliability. In conclusion, the “estimate” of the durability of the ovens’ refractory masonry is arbitrary and completely without foundation.

Let us now see what the basis is for Zimmerman’s claim that 300,000 corpses of Hungarian Jews were cremated in the open. In the booklet *Auschwitz Holocaust Revisionist Jean-Claude Pressac. The “Gassed” People of Auschwitz: Pressac’s New Revisions* (pp. 15-17), I demonstrated on the basis of documents that between May 30 and 31, 1944, about 21,950 Hungarian Jews reached Auschwitz. Zimmerman thinks the percentage of those, which were (allegedly) gassed to be 91% ($=400,000 \div 437,400 \times 100$). It follows that 91% of these 21,950 people, around 19,800, were allegedly “gassed” during the days of May 30 and 31, 1944. Moreover, from May 16 to 31[\[402\]](#) at least 184,000 Hungarian Jews arrived at Auschwitz, of whom therefore 91% or about 167,400 were allegedly “gassed” and cremated in 16 days, on average about 10,500 per day. The minimum number arriving on

May 30, 1944, was around 9,050, of whom about 8,200 would have been “gassed.”

Let us analyze this information on the basis of Filip Müller’s testimony, which describes the preparation of a “cremation pit” as follows: At the bottom of the pit a layer of wood was placed, on top of this 400 corpses were placed, then another layer of wood and another 400 corpses, followed by a further layer of wood and finally another layer of 400 corpses.[\[403\]](#)

He does not specify if this refers to a pit of 40-50 m × 8 m, but the number of corpses is perfectly in accord with such an area.[\[404\]](#)

Let us examine the *hypothesis* most favorable to Zimmerman’s thesis. We assume *ad absurdum* that:

- The Birkenau crematoria could cremate 4,416 corpses in 24 hours
- From 16 to 31 May 1944 the Birkenau crematoria were in operation for 20 hours a day (= 3,680 cremations)
- In a pit of 320 m² 1,200 corpses could be cremated per day.[\[405\]](#)

In this case the crematoria would have been capable of cremating about (3,680×16=) 58,900 corpses during the above 16 days, so that the remaining (167,400–58,900=) 108,500 corpses would have been cremated in the open, on average around 6,800 per day.

The cremation of these 6,800 corpses using the method described by Filip Müller would have required a burning area of about 1,800 m², which would therefore be visible in the air photos of May 31, 1944.

On the other hand, what have Zimmerman’s “experts” found here? A *presumed* burning area of 320 m²! I omit the “three burning pits” in the region of the so-called Bunker 2, since its existence is denied by the Soviet on-site investigation of March 1945. At most another 30 m² of burning area can be conceded, that is, by Zimmerman’s method another 100 cremated corpses.

Therefore, even assuming the *patently absurd* premises most favorable to Zimmerman’s conjecture, the cremation capacity of the “cremation pits” would have been about (1,200+100=) 1,300 corpses per day. And where would the remaining (6,800–1,300=) 5,500 corpses per day have been cremated? They could neither have been cremated in the “pits” nor in the crematory ovens.

Hence, in 15 days – from May 16 to 30 – (15×5,500=) 82,500 corpses would have accumulated for cremation!

I am sure that with a bit of good will Zimmerman’s “experts” shall

succeed in “locating” these corpses on the air photos. Zimmerman only needs to explain carefully to them what it is they must “locate”!

Let us pass from the absurd to the probable. The stratified system of combustion described by Filip Müller is similar to that tried by the Belgian chemist Créteur after the battle of Sedan for the disinfection of the common graves. By pouring tar into the graves themselves and igniting it, Créteur’s purpose was to burn the corpses in the graves in which they lay to prevent epidemics. That was his intention. But what was the result? The following:

[406]

“That the so-called incineration procedure (crémation) was satisfactory cannot be claimed with the certainty the chemist Créteur thinks it can. The success of the procedure was not at all an incineration in the chemical sense, but merely a carbonization; but even the latter, which in and of itself would suffice for hygienic purposes, was not reached to the degree that was necessary to render the corpses harmless. Before the corpse parts could be ignited, the hydrocarbons of the tar had to be burned. But as a result of this the O [Oxygen] content of the air was reduced to such a degree that only a small part was left over for the carbonization, which in addition could have a direct carbonization effect only if the corpse parts had already lost a major part of their water content. As a result of this only the corpse parts at the surface were carbonized, the content in the depth, however, to which O could not get (and that is particularly true for mass graves), was not at all or only to a minor degree involved in that process. The flesh in lower parts was at best roasted by the influence of the heat.”

It is clear that the same problem of oxygen deficiency would occur in two layers less than those claimed by Filip Müller in his “cremation pits.” It is not by chance that Zimmerman tried to twist this fact by turning to the squalid impostures, which I unmasked in points 5-7 of my “Observations,” and it is not by chance that in his *Mea Culpa* appearing in “My Response” he took good care to avoid admitting these “errors.”

What can be conceded to the burning technique described by Filip Müller? At most the burning of 400 corpses in 320 m². [407] The maximum capacity of the four Birkenau ovens was 920 corpses in 20 hours, so that these installations, assuming they operated every day at full speed, could have cremated a *theoretical* maximum of about (16×920=) 14,700 corpses during the above 16 days. Thus, (167,400–14,700=) 152,700 corpses would have

remained to be cremated in the open, on average about $(152,700 \div 16 =) 9,500$ per day.

In order to cremate these corpses, a burning area of $(9,500 \div 400 \times 320 =) 7,600 \text{ m}^2$ would have been needed, that is, – to make a visual comparison – 9.5 times more than that of a crematorium of type IV/V!

Once more: what have Zimmerman's "experts" found in the photographs of May 31, 1944? A *presumed* burning area of 320 m²! Burning the above 152,700 corpses with such "cremation pits" would have ended in August 1945!

Thus the myth of open-air cremations *en mass* is definitely disposed of.

13.7. "The White Bunker"

Let me say, first of all, that I have devoted a specific study to the so-called Birkenau "Bunkers," in which I have demonstrated that these buildings have never existed as homicidal gassing installations.[\[408\]](#) This is yet another book which is waiting for Zimmerman's "definitive refutation"!

In "Body Disposal" Zimmerman writes:

"Holocaust History Project member and computer programmer Mark Van Alstine has examined the May 31 photo for the author and confirms Brugioni's observation that the White Bunker is in the wooded area where the eyewitnesses say it was. He has identified three burning pits in the area of the White Bunker (Mattogno states that there were four).

Van Alstine is able to confirm from the photo the existence of three huts that were used for prisoners undressing near the White Bunker. Recall that Hoess wrote that there were three huts near the White Bunker."

Above I occupied myself with the first part of this "expert's" "discoveries" and showed that these are in conflict with the assessments made by the Soviets in 1945. Let us now confront the question of the "three huts." The Birkenau camp consisted of brick buildings and wooden barracks that could be dismantled (*zerlegbar*). The most common type was the "horse stable barrack type 260/9," which measured 40.76 m × 9.56 m and was used for various purposes. Moreover, these barracks made up most of the *Effektenlager* – 25 barracks among 30, where the property of inmates was stored. The remaining five, of which three were east of the *Zentralsauna*, were of type "Type 501/34" and measured 41.39 m × 12.64 m. The barracks that had a provisional use were dismantled and moved according to the needs

of the day, as is attested to in the documentation of the Central Construction Office.

The “5 barracks for prisoners (special treatment),” which Zimmerman claims for the so-called Bunker 1 and 2 (“Body Disposal”) were horse stable barracks. Therefore, in the area of the “White Bunker” there should appear three barracks of this type.

If we are speaking here of the place where undressing barracks were located according to “witnesses” and the Auschwitz Museum, then we can assert with certainty that van Alstine’s interpretation is simply a swindle, because on the air photos of 31 May, 1944, only three rectangular shapes of deforested and cleaned-up land can be seen in that location, but no barracks. Anyone wishing to convince himself that this is so only has to compare these rectangles with the barracks of the *Effektenlager* to the east of the *Zentralsauna*, which are perfectly visible and clear. It is obvious that Zimmerman’s “experts” find what Zimmerman wants them to find in the photographs!

Let us now proceed to the “Red Bunker.” Let me add that the expressions “Red Bunker” and “White Bunker” are inventions by Zimmerman who fused together the holocaustic designations “Bunker 1” or “little red house” (*czerwony domek*) and “Bunker 2” or “little white house” (*biały domek*).

In “Body Disposal” Zimmerman falsified my statements on the *denomination* of “Bunker,” “white house” and “red house.” In “My Response” Zimmerman had to admit his “error,” adding:

“I pointed out that this structure and the huts next to it – which were used as gas chambers and undressing huts identified by many eyewitnesses – is visible on the May 31 photo. Mattogno has yet to address the issue of the existence of these structures on the photo.”

In my study *Auschwitz: Open Air Incinerations* I have demonstrated that the presence of three “huts” on the photograph of May 31, 1944, is nothing but a lie.²³⁸

As to the structure he calls “Bunker,” there is no question that a structure is visible on the photographs of May 31, 1944. However, with his distorted sense of logic, Zimmerman uses this fact to come to a completely arbitrary conclusion. This is his reasoning: The masonry structure of the “White Bunker” appears in the photographs, therefore the “White Bunker” existed *as a homicidal gas chamber*. With the same distorted logic one can argue as follows: The crematoria structures appear in the photographs (“identified by

many eyewitness” as installations equipped with homicidal gas chambers), therefore the crematoria contained homicidal gas chambers!

That in the photographs there is a structure subsequently named “Bunker 2” is a *fact*. That this building was used as a homicidal gas chamber is an arbitrary *conjecture* – unless Zimmerman claims that the decisive factor is the witnesses: the structure in question is a homicidal gas chamber because that is what the witnesses say. But then (leaving aside the all but irrelevant credibility of the testimonies), why refute my writings at the *technical and documentary* level?

Having created *from nothing* the “three huts” and the *homicidal function* of the structure under discussion, Zimmerman ventures into a comical “prediction” of half a page, in which he himself presents and refutes objections which are based on the two false conclusions mentioned above. The thing is so absurd that it is not worth dwelling upon.

13.8. Pits “Recently Bulldozed”

On examining the air photo of May 31, 1944, Zimmerman’s other “expert” Lucas found, according to Zimmerman’s “Body Disposal”:

“four, possibly five large, recently bulldozed linear excavations... The total length of these excavations is between 1,200 and 1,500 feet. All appear to have recently been covered over, since no shadows are evident. These excavations have the classic appearance of a mass grave site...”

Mattogno claimed that these grave sites had ceased being used in 1943 with the completion of the four crematoria. However, Luca’s observation about their recently being bulldozed shows that they were in current use.”

With his typical deceitfulness, Zimmerman writes that I “claimed that these grave sites had ceased being used in 1943 with the completion of the four crematoria.” As he knows well, this is not *my* assertion but the official thesis of the Auschwitz Museum. In the previously cited article, *Gas Chambers and Crematoria*, an article Zimmerman is well aware of, since he cites it more than once, Franciszek Piper writes:[\[409\]](#)

“In the spring of 1943, with the launching of new gas chambers and crematoria, the two bunkers were shut down. Shortly thereafter, bunker 1 and the nearby barracks were dismantled. The incineration pits were filled in with earth and leveled. The same work was performed on the pits and barracks of bunker 2, but the bunker itself was left intact. It was brought into operation again in May 1944 during the extermination of

Hungarian Jews. At that time several incineration pits were re-excavated and new barracks for undressing were constructed.” (my emphasis)

Piper’s article is based on an analysis of all the testimonies available to the Auschwitz Museum relevant to this matter. If he reaches this conclusion, then it means that no witness (or no witnesses considered to be reliable by him) states the contrary.

So it is only arbitrarily – that is, without the support of any document or any testimony – “without any proof!” – that Zimmerman can claim that the presumed “cremation pits” or “grave sites” of the so-called *Bunker* were active after the crematoria came into operation.

As to the “four, possibly five large, recently bulldozed linear excavations,” Zimmerman says only that Lucas has identified them “outside of the Birkenau complex” without specifying where.

The photographs of May 31, 1944, show traces of four long trenches running north-south, outside of the Birkenau camp at about 160 meters north of crematorium V. Starting in the west, the first two trenches are about 100 meters long, the other two about 130 meters. The width of the trenches is roughly 10 meters. It is, however, wrong to state that these trenches had been “recently bulldozed,” if by “recently” is meant a period of less than several months, because the trenches appear to have been covered by vegetation to a large extent.[\[410\]](#)

Actually, we have here the mass graves dug in 1942 for the burial of the registered detainees who died on account of the tragically deficient sanitary conditions in the camp. During 1942, some 48,500 detainees died. On the basis of the coke supplies we can say that about 12,000 of them could be incinerated in the old crematorium at the main camp, so that another 36,500 had to be buried.²³⁸

On the photographs mentioned above, something like five (perhaps six) “recently bulldozed linear excavations” between 30 and 40 meters long and 9 to 10 meters wide do actually appear at a distance of about 650 meters from crematorium II, but no witness has ever asserted that there were mass graves in that area.

In fact, on the official map of Birkenau appearing on p. 27 of Danuta Czech’s *Kalendarium*, this region is not even mentioned. The “mass graves” are located in a region north of Krema V, beside the “pyre” (*Scheiterhaufen*) of Bunker 1. Other “pyres” are indicated in the area of Bunker 2.[\[411\]](#)

Therefore, whatever these possible “excavations” may be, they are not

associated with the homicidal Bunkers. The distance, as the crow flies, between possible “excavations” and Bunker 2 is about 600 meters, but the distance by road is much longer. The two areas are connected by two roads. One of about 1,500 meters first goes north-east, then turns back towards the south-west, then goes south. The other of about 1,300 meters enters the camp in a south-westerly direction, makes a long curve through the waste water treatment plant area and again leaves the camp in an easterly direction as an extension of the camp road that ran alongside the railway platform.

Since there was enough space for the “cremation pits” in the region of the “White Bunker” what was the point of digging so far away?

Zimmerman himself makes a similar objection, to which I will respond below:

“The problem is as follows: since there already was an area available for these burnings, why was it necessary to create a second area near Krema V?”

But Zimmerman’s problem is this: “since there already was an area available” for the “mass graves” near the so-called *Bunker 1* and one for the “pyres” next to the so-called *Bunker 2*, “why was it necessary to create a second area” so far away? Finally, what does “recently bulldozed” mean in terms of time?

13.9. Ground Photos[\[412\]](#)

Zimmerman writes:

“Rather than actually going to take a look at the photo to see if I had represented it correctly, he [Mattogno] simply made an uninformed statement. The reason was obvious: the expanded edition of the photo was published in 1993 while Mattogno’s comments on the issue in My Banned Holocaust Interview were made in 1996. He did not want to admit that he was not familiar with the photo.

In 1996 he cited the incomplete version of the photo [...]”

The impudence of our professor goes beyond all limits of decency. Since the start of 1990, three years before the publication date mentioned by Zimmerman, I have in my possession two photographs that show a scene of open-air burning. If he has any doubts about this, let the Auschwitz Museum send him a copy of the letter of November 21, which was enclosed with the documents sent to me on this day, among which were the negatives “277, 278 spalanie zwlok na stosach.”

Moreover Zimmerman shows – once again – his bibliographical ignorance. The two photographs had already appeared in the following publications, among others: in 1978 in the book *Auschwitz (Oswiecim) Camp hitlérien d’extermination*,[\[413\]](#) in 1980 in the book *KL Auschwitz. Fotografie dokumentalne*.[\[414\]](#) They were published by Pressac in 1983 in the book *L’album d’Auschwitz*,[\[415\]](#) and again by Pressac in 1989 in his *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers* (p. 422). The clearest photograph (that corresponding to negative 278) was already published by, among others, Jan Sehn in 1961[\[416\]](#) and also by Danuta Czech in the 1989 German edition of her *Kalendarium* (p. 791).

I do not really understand what Zimmerman means when he speaks of the “expanded” photographs. The two photographs in question were taken through an open door from the inside of Krema V. The original photographs are those published by Pressac, which show the rectangular shape of the door. In any case, the photographs are cut to correspond with the door jambs, and it is probably this type of reproduction which Zimmerman names “expanded.”[\[417\]](#) If this is so, he is also mistaken here, since the photograph published by Jan Sehn already in 1961 is “expanded” in this way.

13.9.1. “Cremation Pits” or Pyres?

Earlier I cited the expression “na stosach,” which appears in the November 13, 1990, letter from the Auschwitz Museum. This expression means “on pyres.” The roll of film containing the photographs under discussion (which refers to August 1944) was clandestinely removed from the camp. The note accompanying the roll says that the photographs depict “jeden ze stosów na wolnym powietrzu” (“one of the open-air pyres”).[\[418\]](#) Therefore, the person himself who obtained the clandestine roll of film in the first place and who must have known what he had photographed speaks of “pyres” and not of “cremation pits.”

13.9.2. Analysis of the Photographs

In *My Banned Holocaust Interview* (p. 43) I wrote the following on the above photograph:

“The photograph does not show hundreds of men from the Sonderkommando, or thousands of bodies, but rather, eight men in the midst of about thirty corpses; that is all. Not only does this therefore fail to confirm the mass extermination thesis, it decisively refutes it.”

Zimmerman claims that I used “the incomplete version of the photo,” which, as I showed above, is ridiculous, and then claims that I had “completely misrepresented the true context of the photo,” which is false. Our professor writes:

“First, it is impossible to tell how many Sonderkommandos were involved in this burning operation because the total area of Krema V is not shown in the photo. For all we know, there could have been an additional hundred Sonderkommandos dragging bodies from Krema V.

It is impossible to tell how many additional Sonderkommandos and bodies were involved because the photo simply does not cover the total relevant area from Krema V to the pits. [...]

Second, and more importantly, it is impossible to tell how many bodies are being burned because smoke is obscuring the pits. For all Mattogno knows there could have been hundreds of additional bodies being burned. The photo shows 50 corpses – not the 30 claimed by Mattogno from the incomplete photo – which have not yet been burned. The thick smoke from the photo shows that a significant burning operation is underway. This means that there were more bodies than the 30 mentioned by Mattogno.”

Once again our professor tries to elude the problem with one of his banal tricks. Instead of paying attention to what is in the photograph, Zimmerman attempts to draw our attention to *what is not*. The photograph in question is presented by Zimmerman and his associates as *proof* of the reality of *mass cremation*, so as proof of *mass extermination* at Birkenau. The true problem then is this: Does the photograph in effect show *mass cremation*? As I showed above, *mass extermination* and *mass cremation* means *thousands* of persons per day.

Let us therefore examine *the order of magnitude* of what is in the photograph. The photograph corresponding to negative No. 278 shows a field of vision of about nine meters, of which the smoke – at the level of the base of the wire fence poles – takes up a length of around seven meters. The photograph corresponding to negative No. 277 similarly shows a visual field of about nine meters, but it was taken from a different angle. For this reason it extends the field of view by about two meters. At the level of the base of the poles there is a space of about four meters without smoke. At the extreme left appears a rather blurred figure resembling a guard with a gun over his shoulder. In this area no smoke appears, so that this is the left-hand limit of the area under smoke.

In the first photograph eight standing figures in civilian clothing appear who are assigned to the burning. On the extreme left the leg of a ninth person is visible which almost certainly belongs to the guard of the second photograph. In this photograph six figures in civilian clothing appear, who are assigned to the burning, and the guard. Since the two photographs show fields of vision, which overlap laterally in about 75%, the figures in question are the same and their numbers do not need to be added together. This is what Zimmerman has done in “Body Disposal” writing “it is possible to see 14 Sonderkommandos in uniform.[sic!]” There are two possibilities: either Zimmerman is too inept to understand that the figures in the two photographs are the same – so 8 not 14 – or he has understood this and intended to deceive the reader.

It is now clear that the detainee who took the two photographs wanted to document the “atrocities” of the SS and photographed what seemed to him or what he thought the addressees of the photographs would regard as the most hideous. So if to the right of the field of vision of the first photograph there had been a more atrocious scene than in the second photograph, the detainee photographer would not have missed taking a picture of it. From his position it would have been enough to take half a step to the left rather than to the right. If then the detainee photographer preferred to overlap the field of vision of the two photographs on the left, wasting four meters of “atrocities” (the four meters without smoke), it signifies that on the right there was nothing “atrocious” of interest. That is, it means that the area under smoke began at the right-hand edge of the first photograph. For this reason the smoking area had a length of about 7-8 meters.

As to the number of corpses, Zimmerman judges that *the* photograph “shows 50 corpses.” *Incredibile dictu*, in this tangle of inextricable bodies, our professor has counted them as *exactly* 50! And he admonishes me for having estimated them by eye to be “about thirty.”[\[419\]](#) It is also possible that the number of corpses is about 50, but that does not in the least change *the order of magnitude* of the number.[\[420\]](#) If, on the other hand, Zimmerman has examined them so thoroughly as to count 50 exactly, he will certainly have noticed the strangeness of certain corpses. For example, the one lying at the feet of a standing man with his right arm stretched out could easily be the body of a space alien. Another has no face. It is clear that the corpses have been badly touched up on the negative.

The air photo of August 23, 1944, which has recently been discovered,

shows a single wisp of smoke in the area of crematorium V. The triangulation of the smoking site with respect to the north door of the alleged gas chamber[421] of crematory V corresponds exactly to the locations shown on photographs 277 and 278, which depict the outdoor cremation scene examined above. The air photo of August 23, 1944, thus presents from above what photographs 277 and 278 show from ground level.[422] The cremation site on the air photo measured about 7 by 7 meters, and that size confirms fully my analysis of the two ground level photographs mentioned above.²³⁸ This destroys at the same time all of Zimmerman's dreams of what there *could be* (!) in the yard of crematorium V.

Let me recapitulate the order of magnitude appearing in the photographs under discussion:

- an area of about 7- 8 meters in length under smoke;
- eight men assigned to the burning;
- about 50 corpses waiting to be burned.

This picture is not at all reconcilable with a *mass* cremation of hundreds of corpses (1,200 according to Filip Müller's method) of those presumed gassed, but is perfectly reconcilable with a small burning of tens of corpses of those who had died in the camp.

To this point Zimmerman raises another objection, to which I already alluded above:

“In the article he wrote with Franco Deana and cited throughout the body disposal study, he had admitted to outdoor burnings in the area outside of the camp, but only for the period prior to the building of the crematoria in March 1943. This area, as noted by Mattogno, is visible on the May 31, 1944 photo. The problem is as follows: since there already was an area available for these burnings, why was it necessary to create a second area near Krema V?”

Perhaps “the problem” exists only in Zimmerman's mind. Before Krema II came into operation, the area east of the second waste water treatment plant was also a burning zone simply because the victims of the typhus epidemic of the summer of 1942 could not be cremated in Krema I and were interred in this area in the four long common graves described above. The corpses were later exhumed from these common graves and burnt in the open in the vicinity.

The unusual length of the trenches – between 100 and 130 meters for a width of 10 meters – was due to the high level of the ground-water which did

not allow those graves to be dug any deeper than one meter (the groundwater stood at a depth between 0.3 and 1.2 meters).[\[423\]](#)

In 1944 there was no reason to transport the corpses so far away. In my view, the courtyard north of Krema V was chosen as a burning area only because it was the zone within the camp most protected from indiscrete gazes. Besides, in this way the mortuary chambers for the accumulated corpses awaiting cremation became available.

14. Special Actions

On the question of “special actions” and “special treatments” I do not wish to waste paper for any Zimmerman. The interested reader will find the matter discussed in my book *Special Treatment in Auschwitz*.²³ I can only state that as usual Zimmerman knows nothing and has understood nothing about this subject.

Here I limit myself to discussing the document of December 16, 1942. In “Body Disposal” Zimmerman provided an interpretation of this document – be it only in an hypothetical way – which is clearly refuted by the text itself. He supposed that the SS had executed “some of the workers” while the text says that “all civilian workers” were subjected to this special action! Instead of admitting his error, in “My Response” Zimmerman even tried to confirm his interpretation by clutching at straws:

“Mattoigno attacks me on this point because the memo states that the special action will take place among ‘all civilian workers.’ He writes: ‘If the Zimmerman interpretation is correct, the Gestapo executed all civilian workers’ (Reply, 10). Wrong. I would point out in this respect that it would be possible to carry out executions among all classes of civilian workers involved in the strike without executing all of the civilian workers.”

Certainly, “it would be possible,” but *textually* “it is impossible.” Zimmerman, with his usual deception, tries to pass off a simple logical possibility as a textual possibility. On the other hand, the text categorically excludes the interpretation of “classes.” If he had to appeal to this rabbinical exegesis, poor Zimmerman just did not know how to respond! But he should not be discouraged by this: perhaps he will obtain better results by interpreting the text with *gematria*![\[424\]](#) Zimmerman also rejects Pressac’s interpretation, which is the most reasonable, for the following reason:

“My problem with Pressac’s interpretation is that the memo is marked ‘secret.’ I wondered why a memo that dealt with security checks would have such a marking.”

This “memo” is in reality a “telex” (*Fernschreiben*) addressed to Kammler in Berlin. It is true that it carries the inscription “secret,” but not, as Zimmerman believes, on account of the actual “special action of the Gestapo with all civil workers,” but because of the foreseen “completion” of the crematoria. In fact, this document did not have for its object “Special action of the Gestapo,” but rather “completion of the crematoria,” and this is the sole reason for sending it by telex. Bischoff informs Kammler that the previously fixed terms for completion of the crematoria could not be respected for the following reasons. First of all, the building sites remained closed in December “an numerous days” “due to delousing and disinfestation.” Secondly, the special action of the Gestapo starting on December 16 took quite a few days as the text tells us (“seit 16. Dezember,” = since December 16), so the sites again remained closed. Finally, between December 23, 1942, and January 4, 1943, a permit for the civilian workers was under review, so that the building sites were again inactive. If the weather remained mild and if the availability of labor remained constant, Bischoff foresaw the completion of the crematoria on the following dates: Krema II: January 31, 1943; Krema III: March 31, 1943; Krema IV: February 28, 1943.[\[425\]](#)

On January 4, 1943, Bischoff informed Kammler that it was not possible to respect even these terms, and Kammler accepted this state of affairs on condition that the workers went ahead as quickly as possible. Bischoff had kept him informed on the progress of the work by means of telex.[\[426\]](#)

That Zimmerman has not understood anything of this, should not be surprising. But why should a document on the crematoria have been “secret?” In this regard Zimmerman writes:

“all documents relating to crematoria construction were under a blanket order of secrecy going back to June 1942, meaning that it was not necessary to label each document as such.”

Our professor then cites the document in question:

“Internal Decree (Hausverfugung: [sic]) No. 108.

This is a reminder of decree Number 35 of June 19, 1942.

As is stated in this decree SS-Lieutenant Colonel Dejaco [\[427\]](#) is personally responsible that all in and outgoing plans are registered in an

orderly fashion in a specific book. All outgoing plans have to be signed by the person receiving them.

Furthermore, all this work is related to econo-military tasks that must be kept secret.

Specifically, the plans for the crematoria must be strictly controlled (strengstens zu beaufsichtigen). No plans are to be passed to the work brigade of others. During the construction work they are to be kept under lock and key... In particular attention should be paid to the regulations of D.V. 91 (secret matters/documents). (Vorschluss [sic[428]]–Sachen).”

In this regard I observe the following:

1. This document refers *exclusively* to “plans” in general and to those for the crematoria in particular. It does not in the least mention the *ordinary* correspondence on the crematoria.

Therefore Zimmerman’s claim that there never appears any mention of “secret” in this correspondence consequent to the above order is unfounded. This cannot even be inferred for the “plans” of the crematoria themselves. The document does not refer to the *bureaucratic* question of affixing the “secret” stamp on these “plans,” but to the *practical* problem of supervising them carefully.

As far as the crematoria are concerned, the motivation behind this arrangement was the fact that the Central Construction Office regularly entrusted the crematory plans to civilian firms, which carried out the work, and it was not known in what hands the plans might end up.

2. The crematoria had no privilege of secrecy over other buildings. A letter from the SS New Construction Office of Dachau of September 30, 1940, mentions the fact that “according to the order of Reichsführer-SS, all plans of buildings in concentration camps are to be considered as secret plans.”[429]
3. Not even the concentration camps had any privilege of secrecy. In the “Destruction protocol on the destruction of ‘secret matters’ and ‘secret state matters’ of the Organisation Todt of January 30, 1945, we find among the “state secrets” destroyed documents such as “air-raid damage report,” “ventilated air-raid shelter types,” “construction material,” “construction of an additional fire fighter shelter,” “drink water supply,” “bridge Oderfurt,” “air-raid.”[430]

If Zimmerman had adequate historical or documentary knowledge, then he would be aware that for the SS everything was “secret,” as Pressac pointed

out!

15. Appendix: The Fantasies of Daniel Keren

Daniel Keren is the author of a *Technical Discussion: Refutation of “Holocaust revisionist” claims concerning cremation*.[\[431\]](#) The only thing “technical” about it is the adjective. To all appearances he is associated with his compatriot Zimmerman who mentions him in note 181 of “Body Disposal” in a vain attempt to refute my study on cremation at Auschwitz, even though Keren has the good sense never to cite me. As to Keren’s knowledge on thermotechnical matters in general and on the structure and operation of crematory ovens in particular, he is still more ignorant than Zimmerman, so that our two “experts” form a nice pair: the blind leading the blind!

In his “technical” discussion, Keren repeats all of Zimmerman’s absurd conjectures but adds some new ones. So here I will deal briefly with Daniel Keren’s new “technical” conjectures.

15.1. “Burning more than one Corpse Simultaneously”

“There are many testimonies describing this ‘technique’ (see, for instance, Henryk Tauber’s testimony). The ‘Holocaust revisionists’ claim that it is impossible; however, while it is certainly illegal today, there is no technical problem in burning a few corpses in the same muffle at the same time.”

Then he cites a 1994 book which mentions cases of multiple cremation in present-day crematoria.

Keren immediately begins with a lie: the “Holocaust revisionists” do not say that multiple cremation in the crematory coke ovens of Auschwitz-Birkenau is “impossible.” Rather, he says that, in this way, an economically good cremation, one effectively saving time and fuel, is “impossible.”

The example cited by this other naïve person cannot even remotely serve as a term of comparison, because he considers ultramodern installations heated with gas or liquid fuel and also because he does not specify the duration of such multiple cremations nor how much fuel they require.

In the face of chemical and physical laws, the declarations of Tauber are worth as much as those of Zimmerman.

15.2. “Running the Furnaces Continually”

Keren writes that the revisionists state that “continuous operation harms the furnaces.” He objects saying that the truth is the contrary, as is indicated by the July 14, 1941, letter of Topf to the SS New Construction Office of Mauthausen (which Keren knows only through *Kalendarium* of Auschwitz!), which says (I cite from the original document):[\[432\]](#)

“The fact is that the fire-proof material lasts longer if an even temperature is maintained at all times in the oven.”

This dilettante confuses the inevitable wear of the oven’s refractory masonry due to usage (number of cremations) with consecutive method of cremation. These are two completely different things. The assertion of Topf is most true in theory, but in practice a forced draft would have exposed the refractory masonry to a larger thermal load, and so to a greater wear. In fact, it was about the guarantee for the oven – that is, the financial expenditure – for which Topf imposed the following conditions on its clients:[\[433\]](#)

“Guarantee for six months, for three month in case of day-and-night operation.”

As we have seen above, the “parts exposed to fire” were not covered by the guarantee, evidently because they wore down too easily.

15.3. “Saving Fuel”

Keren writes:

“‘Holocaust revisionists’ claim that not enough coke was delivered to Auschwitz, to cremate the number of people that historians agree were murdered there.”

This claim is allegedly false for two reasons, so Keren:

“Firstly, one has to know that many corpses in Auschwitz-Birkenau were burned in the open; this mainly took place in 1944, but during other periods as well.”

In reality the calculation on coke consumption as a function of the number of cremations – which I performed – deals with the period from March 15 to October 25, 1943, when burning in the open was *not* carried out. For this period the supply of coke (and wood) to the crematoria is exactly known and the corresponding fuel sufficed to cremate the detainees of the camp who had died, but was *absolutely insufficient* for the corpses of the alleged gassed. If Keren is undeceptive – something I doubt very much – let him read

attentively paragraph 10.2. “The Number of Cremations in 1943: Coke Fuel Consumption” of my article “The Crematoria Ovens of Auschwitz and Birkenau.”⁸

The second reason cited by Keren is this:

“Lastly, the Auschwitz-Birkenau furnaces used compressed air which was injected into them to enhance the burning. The fact that this can save a great deal of fuel was noted by the Engineer Mueller, who in 1937 planned a crematorium for the Dachau concentration camp.”

This incompetent person has understood nothing! The oven of the firm W. Müller of Allach was structured in such a way that air for combustion was introduced by means of a blower through the grill bars of the fire-resistant clay muffle, so from bottom to top. According to the constructor, with this system the quantity of air necessary for combustion of the corpses closely approached the theoretical minimum of air required for combustion. The presumed[\[434\]](#) saving of fuel[\[435\]](#) depended on this very fact. Besides, the oven was provided with a furnace blower, which served to augment the capacity of the grills and so the hourly availability of heat for the oven. According to the constructor, it is true that in the case of numerous cremations, consecutive cremations could be carried out “without or nearly without additional fuel,” but it is also true that a wood coffin of about 35 kg was foreseen for the cremation, which alone is equivalent to about 17.5 kg of coke!

The story of cremations without fuel is a fable, on which even Kurt Prüfer would have expressed irony in non-suspect times.

When engineer Hans Volckmann wrote in 1930 that the gas-heated oven conceived by himself and Karl Ludwig (the famous Volckmann-Ludwig oven, which became the most dangerous rival of the gas-heated Topf ovens), and which was installed in the Hamburg-Ohlsdorf crematorium, cremated 3,500 corpses in seven months[\[436\]](#) with a total coke consumption of hardly 103 m³, Prüfer objected:

“It is maintained that 3,500 cremations have been carried out at Hamburg with a total coke consumption of 100 m³ [to be exact, 103]. This is disputable, first of all because, according to statements made independently to me in Hamburg by two stokers who run the oven, normal gas consumption is 7 m³, perhaps even a little more. [...]

Should the assertions on cremation without supplementary gas be precise, the temperature of the exhaust gas^[437] would have to be equal

to the ambient temperature, which no technical expert on combustion can seriously maintain, since in thermal balance the inevitable losses of heat from the exhaust gas and the cold air which flows in when the coffin is introduced^[438] are disadvantages which cannot be avoided.”

Therefore, not even the Volckmann-Ludwig gas oven – the best oven of the 1930’s and 1940’s – even with a continuous operation (for seven months, 12 cremations per day on average) – could cremate without supplementary fuel *apart from the heat supplied by the coffin.*^[439]

On the other hand, the Birkenau three-muffle coke ovens had a rather crude system for delivering air for combustion. They were equipped with a single blower (*Druckluftanlage*) that served all three muffles without the possibility of regulating the flow of air into each muffle. The end-part of the air conduit was walled in over the bend of the muffle. The air emerged from the conduit by passing over four rectangular 10 cm × 8 cm apertures made in the refractory masonry, so from top to bottom, exactly the *opposite* principle of the Müller oven!

On the other hand, the eight-muffle ovens in Kremas IV and V were completely without blowers. But in spite of this, according to the Central Construction Office letter of June 28, 1943, referring to one muffle, they had exactly the same cremation capacity as the three-muffle ovens, as the following calculation shows:

- Three-muffle oven: $1,440 \div 15 = 96$ corpses per muffle in 24 hours.
- Eight-muffle oven: $768 \div 8 = 96$ corpses per muffle in 24 hours.

But then, what was the use of the *Druckluftanlagen*? Clearly none at all!

16. Conclusion

The fact that American Holocaust institutions, in spite of their enormous financial resources, have been reduced to placing their trust in naïve dilettantes like Zimmerman and Keren as the best “specialists” on cremation, is proof of the inexorable collapse of “Holocaust” history.

Abbreviations

AMM:	Archive of the Museum of Mauthausen (Öffentliches Denkmal und Museum Mauthausen)
APMO:	Archiwum Pastwowego Muzeum Oswiecim-

	Brzezinka (Archive of the State Museum Auschwitz-Birkenau)
BAK:	Bundesarchiv Koblenz (German Federal Archives)
FSBRS	Federal'naja Služba Bezopasnosti Rossiiskoi Federatsii (Federal Security Office of the Russian Federation), Moscow
GARF	Gosudarstvenni Archiv Rossiskoi Federatsii (State Archive of the Russian Federation), Moscow
NA	National Archives, Washington D.C.
ÖDMM	Öffentliches Denkmal und Museum Mauthausen (Public Memorial and Museum)
RGVA:	Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennii Vojennii Archiv (Russian State Archive of the War, the former TCIDK – Tsentral'naja Chranenija Istoriko-dokumental'nykh Kollekcii, Center for the Conservation of Historical-Documentary Collections), Moscow
VHA	Vojenský Historický Archiv (Historical-Military Archive), Prague

Professor Perjury

By Germar Rudolf

A new corny joke was added in 1999 to the debate around the *Leuchter Report*[\[440\]](#) on the alleged homicidal gas chambers of Auschwitz by Prof. James Roth from the Alpha Analytic Laboratories, Ashland, Massachusetts. I discuss this event here because Prof. Roth's allegations were widely publicized by the international media in connection with the libel case of British historian David Irving against Deborah E. Lipstadt.[\[441\]](#)

For his documentary movie *Mr. Death* on Fred A. Leuchter, Errol Morris also interviewed Prof. Dr. James Roth.[\[442\]](#) In 1988, Roth's laboratory had analyzed the masonry samples from the alleged gas chambers taken by Leuchter in Auschwitz for their cyanide content. During the trial against Ernst Zündel in Toronto that same year, for which the *Leuchter Report* had been produced, Prof. Dr. Roth himself was interrogated as an expert witness. Roughly ten years later Errol Morris interviewed Roth about this event. During this interview, Prof. Roth did all he possibly could to distance himself from the possible consequences of the analyses performed by his company. His interview gained importance only due to the fact that the Dutch cultural historian Prof. Robert van Pelt quoted Roth in his 1999 expert report prepared for the Irving trial. In it, van Pelt wrote about Roth's statements in Morris' movie:[\[443\]](#)

"Roth explained that cyanide will react on the surface of brick or plaster, penetrating the material not more than 10 microns, or 0.01 mm, or one tenth the thickness of a human hair [...]. In other words, if one wants to analyze the cyanide concentration in a brick sample, one should take a representative sample of the surface, 10 microns thick, and no more."

It can be shown that Prof. Dr. James Roth intentionally made a wrong statement, that is to say, he is a liar:

Cyanide concentrations in selected plaster samples
taken from the walls of the Birkenau delousing
chambers.

Acc. to G. Rudolf/Institut Fresenius, Taunusstein, Germany

Values given in mg per kg; %Fe: Proportion of total iron content of sample converted to Iron Blue

#	Building	Location and depth of sample taken	Material	c[CN ⁻]	c[Fe]	%Fe
9	B1a BW 5a	Inner side, external wall (west), 120 cm from northern wall, 155 cm from floor, 0-2 mm.	Plaster	11000.0	12000	75
11	B1a BW 5a	As 9, 1-10 mm.	Plaster	2640.0	6000	36
12	B1a BW 5a	Easter wall (inside), 170 cm from northern wall, 170 cm from floor, (east. hot air chamber), 0-2 mm.	Plaster	2900.0	8500	28
13	B1a BW 5a	As 12, 2-10 mm.	Plaster	3000.0	9000	27
14	B1a BW 5a	Outside western wall, 40 cm from southern side, 160 cm from soil, 0-5 mm.	Brick	1035.0	25000	3,5
15a	B1a BW 5a	Outside southern wall, 40 cm from western side, 210 cm from soil, 0-3 mm.	Mortar	1560.0	10000	13
16	B1b BW 5b	Outside southern wall, 2 m from entrance door, 1 m from soil, 0-7 mm.	Brick	10000.0	47000	17

17	B1b BW 5b	Inside, southern wall, 130 cm from eastern wall, 130 cm from floor, 4-10 mm.	Plaster	13500.0	15000	74
19a	B1b BW 5b	Inside, northern wall, 230 cm from eastern wall, 90 cm from floor, 0-4 mm.	Plaster	1860.0	4300	35
19b	B1b BW 5b	As 19a, 4-8 mm.	Plaster	3880.0	9500	33
20	B1a BW 5a	Inside, external wall (west), 40 cm from southern wall, 210 cm from floor, 0-3 mm.	Lime Plaster	7850.0	11000	59
22	B1a BW 5a	Inner side of exterior wall (south), 40 cm from western wall, 155 cm from floor, 3-10 mm.	Lime Plaster	4530.0	11000	34

- l. It is a fact that the walls of the disinfestation chambers in Auschwitz, Birkenau, Stutthof, and Majdanek are filled with cyanide compounds, and this not only superficially, but into the depth of the masonry, as I have proved by taking samples from different depths of the wall, compare in this regard especially my samples no. 11, 13, 17, 19b, and 23 in the Table 19 of my expert report (for an excerpt see the table above).[\[444\]](#) They prove that hydrogen cyanide can rather easily reach deep layers of plaster and mortar. But even the other samples taken from the surface prove that Prof. Roth's allegation is wrong: Provided that most of the cyanide detectable today is present in the form of iron cyanide (Iron Blue and other cyanoferrates), as Prof. Roth assumes himself, his thesis would mean that 10% to 75% of the iron content of these samples are located in the upper 10 micrometer of my samples (0.010 mm), that is, they are located in less than 1% of the entire sample mass, and the rest of the sample would have

been massively deprived of iron. Of course, this cannot be the case, because there is no mechanism that could achieve this.

2. Furthermore, expert literature is detailed in that hydrogen cyanide
 1. is an extremely mobile chemical compound with physical properties comparable to water,[\[445\]](#)
 2. which can quite easily penetrate through thick, porous layers like walls.[\[446\]](#)
3. In addition, it is generally known that cement and lime mortar are highly porous materials, comparable for instance to sponges.[\[447\]](#) In such materials, there does not exist something like a defined layer of 0.01 mm beyond which hydrogen cyanide could not diffuse, as there can also be no reason, why water could not penetrate a sponge deeper than a millimeter. Steam, for example, which behaves physically comparable to hydrogen cyanide, can very easily penetrate walls.
4. Finally, the massive discolorations of the *outside* walls of the disinfestation chambers in Birkenau and Stutthof, as shown in my expert report,[\[448\]](#) are clearly visible and conclusive evidence for the fact how easily hydrogen cyanide and its soluble derivatives can penetrate such walls.

As a professor of analytical chemistry, Prof. Roth must know this, so one can only wonder why he spreads such outrageous lies. As proof that this is indeed a lie, I refer the reader to what Prof. Roth himself stated while testifying under oath during the second so-called Zündel trial:[\[449\]](#)

“In porous materials such as brick or mortar, the Prussian blue [recte: hydrogen cyanide] could go fairly deep as long as the surface stayed open, but as the Prussian blue formed, it was possible that it would seal the porous material and stop the penetration.”

Prof. Roth might have felt obligated to attack Leuchter in order to avoid becoming himself a target of certain lobby groups who already managed to destroy Leuchter’s career. But that does not change the fact that he either lied during his interview with Errol Morris or that he made knowingly false statements during his testimony under oath, that is to say: he committed perjury. My suspicion of Prof. Roth’s dishonesty is supported by another statement Prof. Roth made during this interview: if he had known where Leuchter’s samples originated from, his analytical results would have been different.[\[450\]](#) Does that mean that Prof. Roth manipulates his result according to whether or not he likes the origin of certain samples? Such an

attitude is exactly the reason why one should never tell an “independent” laboratory about the origin of the samples to be analyzed, simply because “independence” is a very flexible term when it comes to controversial topics. What Prof. Dr. Roth has demonstrated here is only his lack of professional honesty.

One may be inclined to forgive Prof. Dr. Jan van Pelt that he used this statement by Prof. Roth during David Irving’s libel suit against Jewish theologian Deborah Lipstadt, because van Pelt himself has no idea about chemistry.

Denying Evidence

The Phony “Holocaust” “Convergence of Evidence”

By Carlo Mattogno

Introduction

The book *Denying History. Who Says the Holocaust Never Happened and Why Do They Say it?* by Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman^[451] is a critique of revisionism which has the ambition to place itself – as opposed to previous polemicists – on an objective and scientific platform.

These authors pretend to defend freedom of speech, but they are merely compiling page after page of their purported historical philosophy, embarking upon various excursions, which, beyond merely pretending to be scholarship, are simple fluff. This “multiyear” job (p. 2) required them to go from the United States to Europe for “research in the camps, in particular to Mauthausen, Majdanek, Treblinka, Sobibor, Belzec, Dachau, Auschwitz, and Auschwitz-Birkenau” (p. 127). We can well imagine that, with all the expenses paid by their financial backers, they couldn’t simply put out a booklet of some tens of pages. Because this is what their product boils down to if you strip away the tinsel.

Denying History has grand ambitions, to “take up the contentions of the Holocaust deniers, point by point, and refute them, down to the smallest detail,” according to Arthur Hertzberg (p. xiii), prefacing a contention clearly expressed by the authors:

“In the process we thoroughly refute the Holocaust deniers’ claims and arguments, present an in-depth analysis of their personalities and motives, and show precisely, with solid evidence, how we know the Holocaust happened.” (p. 2)

Shermer and Grobman assert that their book is

“a thorough and thoughtful answer to all the claims of the Holocaust deniers [...]” (p. 257)

So, Shermer and Grobman refuted “thoroughly” *all* the theses of *all* the revisionists. This is absolutely false.^[452]

The claims by these authors are infected right from the start by such a

basic falsehood.

To such teachers of lies, I have previously dedicated four studies, in which I have refuted their false accusations one by one; they are:

- *Olocausto: dilettanti allo sbaraglio* (Holocaust: Fumblers make fools of themselves), Edizioni di Ar, 1996, 322 pages;
- *L “Irritante questione” delle camere a gas ovvero da Cappuccetto Rosso ad...Auschwitz. Risposta a Valentina Pisanty* (The “confusing question” of the gas chambers, or from Little Red Riding Hood to... Auschwitz.” [\[453\]](#) Response to Valentina Pisanty), Graphos, Genoa, 1998, 188 pages;
- *Olocausto: dilettanti a convengo* (Holocaust: Fumblers’ Get-Together), Effepi, Genoa 2002, 182 pages.
- *Olocausto: dilettanti nel web* (Holocaust: Internet Dilettantes), Effepi, Genova 2005, 132 pages.

To these I add my two responses to Professor John C. Zimmerman, which have been reprinted in the current book in a revised form (starting on p. 87). [\[454\]](#)

Nobody has ever answered the questions presented in the above works, while theses published in books by authors such as Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Deborah Lipstadt, Georges Wellers – three names among others – continue to be cited in the writings of “anti-deniers,” although I have exposed them all as patently false long time ago. Their false theses are thus kept alive by a whole series of incestuous citations, a procedure, which Shermer and Grobman obviously attribute to revisionist historiography (p. 251).

Far from a supposed, unavowable anti-Semitic and neo-Nazi origin, the present work was born from my indignation at the falsifications of Shermer and Grobman, which I will document rigorously. I am also motivated by the pleasure I feel when unmasking these falsifications and in re-establishing historical truth.

Being quite aware that this work, too, will inevitably fall into the silent catacombs of established holocaust historiography, I hope that it may prove useful to some honest people free from prejudice. After all, they may be presented with new considerations different from the four works mentioned above. The present work also demonstrates how a single historical revisionist can demolish in a few weeks the “multiyear” work achieved with the collaboration of the world-wide holocaust establishment. For the historians who are part of this establishment, this is no doubt the most disconcerting

effect. It goes well beyond the solid arguments that have brought about their embarrassed silence.

1. Revisionists and Revisionist Method

1.1. The Revisionists

In contrast to their predecessors, Shermer and Grobman purport to be on a strictly scientific plane:

“We think it’s time to move beyond name calling and present the evidence.” (pp. 16f.)

But with that, they show that they know very well the nature of previous criticisms of revisionism: insults and absence of proof!

They even pretend to reject the most worn out anti-revisionist arguments:

“The subtleties and complexities of the Holocaust denial movement deny such global labels as ‘anti-Semitic’ or ‘neo-Nazi.’ To resort to labels is to misunderstand what is really going on and therefore to swat down straw men.” (p. 16)

But then Shermer and Grobman simply cannot resist the temptation to resort to the labels of “anti-Semitic” and “neo-Nazi,” alleging that, in their view, in revisionism “the anti-Semitic theme returns over and over” and that “it seems difficult to clearly separate the Holocaust denial movement from anti-Semitic sentiments.” (p. 87)

And then sweeter and deeper:

“Holocaust deniers, in our opinion, find empowerment through the rehabilitation of those they admire and the denigration of those they perceive to be squelching their admiration [...]. The history of the Holocaust is a black eye for Nazism. Deny the veracity of the Holocaust, and Nazism begins to lose this stigma.” (p. 252)


This is the actual significance of the formula, according to which revisionism is “the rewriting of the past for present personal or political purposes” (p. 2), which the authors are pleased with (see p. 34 and p. 238). Therefore Shermer and Grobman bring back through the window the trite defamations they pretended to have chased out through the door. And the insults re-enter also: Nobody “in their right mind would say that the Holocaust never happened” (p. 40), ergo...

Let’s not even take into account that revisionism “is an affront against history and how the science of history is practiced” (p. 251), and “a looking-

glass world where black is white, up is down, and the normal rules of reason no longer apply.” (p. 1)

Shermer and Grobman admit that revisionists “are highly motivated, reasonably well financed [if only that were true] and often well versed in Holocaust studies. [...]. The deniers know a great deal about the Holocaust” (pp. 17f.). Indeed, they have found the American revisionists they have encountered to be “relatively pleasant” (p. 40), which seems a little strange for alleged neo-Nazi anti-Semites who are not “in their right mind”!

But the truth regarding historical revisionism is an entirely different thing. Every deceptive attempt to force revisionist historians into the worn-out category of anti-Semites and neo-Nazis is invariably made “for personal or political reasons” and is as misleading as the title of the very book by Shermer and Grobman: *Denying History*. What revisionist historians deny is not “history,” but the distorted interpretation of it as dished up by Holocaust historians. Revisionism, born from denying this distortion, is the reassertion of historical truth.



The revisionist activity of Paul Rassinier began as a denial of the lies, with which the concentration camp literature of the post-war period was studded.[\[455\]](#) It was motivated by an indignation when facing such lies and a desire to re-establish truth. That is one of the most important motivations driving revisionist historians: indignation at the imposture of Holocaust historians. The Holocaust historians misuse their positions of power to trick unaware readers, and they can only maintain such positions by tricking uniformed readers. My motivation in exposing the fraudulent *Denying History* was my indignation at the Shermer/Grobman imposture and my desire to reaffirm historical truth.

As we see in their introduction, the authors claim to have refuted “thoroughly” *all* the theses of *all* revisionist historians, and in regard to this they maintain:

“We tried to check the accuracy of our assumptions about the deniers by meeting and interviewing the major players of the Holocaust denial

movement, and reading their literature carefully.” (p. 4)

For them, revisionism is confined to M. Weber, D. Irving, R. Faurisson, B. Smith, E. Zündel and D. Cole (pp. 46-71).

Arthur Butz is already too hard a bone to chew for Shermer and Grobman. Therefore they limit themselves to liquidating his work *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* as “the book that has become the Bible of the movement” (p. 40), which evidently is true only in their narrow provincialism. The same thing goes for their judgment of Mark Weber as the one who “with the possible exception of David Irving [...] has the most knowledge of Holocaust history” (p. 46). Shermer and Grobman, in their America-centric megalomania, have forgotten three really significant details:

1. They have only addressed the works of *a part* of American revisionism (ignoring for example F.P. Berg, S. Crowell, B. Renk, T. O’Keefe, W. Lindsey, M. Hoffman. R. Countess).
2. American revisionism is only *one small part* of world-wide revisionism.
3. American revisionism, with all due respect for its history, as far as research goes, is far from being the most important part of world-wide revisionism. That most important part is European revisionism. But for Shermer and Grobman, European revisionism apparently means only Robert Faurisson, of whose theses they have considered only an insignificant part, and moreover, as we shall see in the following paragraph, in a shameless misrepresentation!

The truth is that European revisionism currently means the journal *Vierteljahrshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* (PO Box 118, Hastings TN34 3ZQ, England), with its founder Germar Rudolf and his co-workers (as well as the parallelly published English journal *The Revisionist*). European revisionism also means, citing only the most important ones, Jürgen Graf, Jean-Marie Boisdefeu, Enrique Aynat, Henri Roques, Pierre Marais, Serge Thion, Pierre Guillaume, Udo Walendy, Ingrid Weckert, Hans Jürgen Nowak, Werner Rademacher, Walter Sanning, and Wilhelm Stäglich.[\[456\]](#)

In the “Essential Revisionist Bibliography,” which I included in the 1996 study *Olocausto: dilettanti allo sbaraglio* (pp. 308f.), there are 33 titles, but Shermer and Grobman have considered a mere four, of which three are American! And although Shermer and Grobman selected only this modest section of revisionism, they still had to struggle for years just to give an appearance of a scholarly response:

“This problem came to our attention in talking to the top Holocaust

scholars in the world. In many cases we have had to go to great lengths during this multiyear project to get answers to our questions.” (p. 2, emphasis added)

So “the top Holocaust scholars in the world” didn’t even know how to respond to the arguments of minor revisionist scholars carefully selected by the authors! We figure that – according to their deceptive premises – if they would have had to correctly answer all the arguments of revisionism, their “project” would have taken decades!

1.2. The True Historical Method and the Alleged Method of Revisionists

In Chapter 9, Shermer and Grobman present a long and inflated excursus on the “Rape of Nanking” – an alleged war crime during the Japanese invasion of the Chinese city of Nanking in December 1937 – whose historical reconstruction

“culminated on May 3, 1946, when the International Military Tribunal for the Far East opened what became known as The Tokyo War Crimes Trial.” (p. 236)

In other words, the presumed fact was “reconstructed” in order to demonstrate inhumane Japanese ferocity and to morally justify the atomic devastations of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as well as the carpet bombing of Tokyo and other Japanese cities by the Americans.

After this diversion, our authors finally return to their topic, with their ten hinges of a scientific method:

“1. How reliable is the source of the claim? Deniers may appear quite reliable as they cite facts and figures, but closer examination often reveals these details have been distorted or taken out of context.

2. Has this source made other claims that were clearly exaggerated? If an individual is known to have stretched the facts before, it obviously undermines his or her credibility. [...]

3. Has another source verified the claim? Typically deniers will make statements that are unverified or verified only by another denier. [...] Outside verification is crucial to good science and good history.

4. How does the claim fit with what we know about the world and how it works? [...].

5. Has anyone, including and especially the claimant, gone out of the

way to disprove the claim, or has only confirmatory evidence been sought? This is what is known as ‘confirmation bias,’ or the tendency to seek confirmatory evidence and reject disconfirming evidence. [...].

6. In the absence of clearly defined proof, does the preponderance of evidence converge on the claimant’s conclusion or a different one? Deniers do not look for evidence that converges on a conclusion; they look for evidence that fits their ideology. In examining their various eyewitness accounts of the gassing of prisoners at Auschwitz, for example, we find a consistent core to the stories, leading to a strong theory of what happened. Deniers, in contrast, pick up on minor discrepancies in the eyewitness reports and blow these up as anomalies that disconfirm the theory. Instead of reviewing the evidence as a whole, they focus on any detail that supports their point of view.

7. Is the claimant employing the accepted rules of reason and tools of research or only ones that lead to the desired conclusions? [...].

8. Has the claimant provided a different explanation for the observed phenomena rather than just denying the existing explanation? [...].

9. If the claimant has proffered a new explanation, does it account for as many phenomena as the old explanation does? [...].

10. Do the claimant’s personal beliefs and biases drive the conclusions or vice versa?” (pp. 248-250)

And here is the alleged behavior of revisionists as per Shermer and Grobman:

“Deniers are routinely unreliable in their selection of the historical facts. They often make outrageous claims. The claims are rarely verified by other sources, and when they are, these sources are often incestuous. Deniers almost never attempt to disprove their claims and, instead, seek only confirmatory evidence. They generally do not play by the agreed-upon rules of historical scholarship, offer no alternative theory to account for the historical data, and thus can muster no convergence of evidence for their nonexistent theory [sic]. Finally, as we have demonstrated with a preponderance of evidence, Holocaust deniers’ personal beliefs and biases dictate their conclusions.” (p. 251)

In this study I will demonstrate, “with a preponderance of evidence,” that the authors have outlined here a perfect description of themselves and their methods. But before entering into the heart of this discussion, some general observations are in order.

To begin with, it would be much too easy to find the entire work of Shermer and Grobman as failing in terms of their first point, that is to say, as being based upon their *selection* of authors and revisionist arguments, and thus amputating and distorting the entire thematic picture.

In their work, the authors have adopted a magical formula: “convergence of evidence,” allegedly adopted by Holocaust historians and allegedly neglected by revisionist historians. That formula was invented by Robert J. van Pelt in his expert opinion as part of the Irving-Lipstadt trial and known as *The Pelt Report*.[\[457\]](#) As no evidence exists of extermination of Jews in homicidal gas chambers, van Pelt collected all the available “indications” (including those by J.-C. Pressac), illicitly promoted them to “evidence” and then invented a “convergence of evidence,” which is nothing but scientific imposture.

As an example, let’s look at the “convergence of evidence” regarding Auschwitz adopted by the authors. The eyewitness testimonies all have a “solid nucleus” according to Shermer and Grobman, converging toward reality of homicidal gassings. Revisionist historians, on the other hand, attack “smaller discrepancies” and “any detail” in order to demolish the entire testimony.

It is the very opposite that is true. First of all, Shermer and Grobman as well as most Holocaust historians, ignore the *complete texts* of these eyewitness testimonies and only present anthologies[\[458\]](#) by carefully selecting passages of the testimonies in order to create an illusory “convergence,” while purging all the absurdities and contradictions that they contain.

A typical example of this “convergence” is offered to us by G. Reitlinger. Describing the alleged homicidal gassings in Birkenau, he appeals:

- a) to Ada Bimko for so-called “railwagons” transporting the corpses to the ovens;
 - b) to Miklos Nyiszli for the gassing process;
 - c) to Charles Sigismud Bendel for the emptying of the gas chambers.
- [\[459\]](#)

Examining the narration of Reitlinger, it seems that all the witnesses describe the same structures and the same facts, but reality is very different.

Ada Bimko never put foot in a crematorium. She invented a fanciful story of some visit to a crematorium and allegedly “saw” a gas chamber equipped with “two huge metallic containers containing gas” and rail tracks that led

directly to the furnace room.[\[460\]](#) The unprepared “eyewitness” in fact believed that alleged homicidal gassings occurred with a gas similar to methane (therefore inventing the two containers) and that, in accordance with the so-called Vrba-Wetzler report, a narrow-gauge track ran from “the gas chambers” to “the ovens.”[\[461\]](#)

Actually, in none of the Birkenau Crematoria the rooms, to which official historiography attributes the function of homicidal gas chambers, were connected to the respective oven rooms via rail tracks and little wagons. Therefore we are dealing with a grossly false testimony.[\[462\]](#)

M. Nyiszli and C.S. Bendel, two self-styled members of the so-called “*Sonderkommando*”[\[463\]](#) of Birkenau who allegedly lived in the same places at the same time (not to go more deeply into details), described the alleged gas chambers of Crematoria II and III of Birkenau, which actually measured 30 by 7 m and were 2.41 m high, as being 200 m long (Nyiszli[\[464\]](#)) and as being 10 meters long, 4 meters wide, and 1.60 meters high (Bendel[\[465\]](#)). Is it really just a minor “detail” that of these two witnesses describing a room of an actual length of 30 m, one claims a length of 200 m and the other claims a length of 10 m?

And what about the fact that Nyiszli had published in the Hungarian newspaper *Világ* a whole series of entirely fabricated articles purporting to be his testimony at the IG-Farben trial?[\[466\]](#) Another minor “detail”? And what about the many historical falsifications that I have exposed in an appropriate study?[\[467\]](#) More minor “details”?

Another example of false “convergence” is the description of eyewitnesses Filip Müller and Miklos Nyiszli regarding the gassing process: Müller had simply plagiarized Nyiszli’s testimony (using the German translation, which appeared in the magazine *Quick* of Munich in 1961 with the title “*Auschwitz. Tagebuch eines Lagerarztes*”), who had invented the scene he described on the – erroneous – assumption that the Zyklon B used for the gassings was based on chlorine and therefore had a much higher density than air.[\[468\]](#) So we have a “convergence,” alright, but of a lie. Another “convergence” of a lie is the “tall tale” of so-called wire mesh devices allegedly used to introduce Zyklon B into the alleged homicidal gas chambers of Crematoria II and III, ostensibly manufactured by Michał Kula and allegedly “seen” by Henryk Tauber – devices that never existed![\[469\]](#) So this is how they fabricate “convergence of evidence!” We shall present other examples.

Point 2 of the methodic principles of Shermer and Grobman reads that “if an individual is known to have stretched the facts before, it obviously undermines his or her credibility.” In other words, if an individual has lied once, that individual is no longer credible. Quite so, but just look at how these Holocaust historians disregard this principle with their witnesses!

To stay with Auschwitz, one can assert with certainty and without fear of refutation that none of these witnesses – and I emphasize *none* – has told the truth about the crematory ovens of Birkenau. But all of them – and I once again emphasize *all* – have shamelessly lied about the operation and about the cremation capacity of these systems, topping with the apex of ridiculous absurdities such as Dov Paisikovic (that the cremation of one corpse took four minutes!),[\[470\]](#) Stanislaw Jankowski alias Alter Feinsilber (that 12 corpses were cremated in every muffle at a time!),[\[471\]](#) and of Miklos Nyiszli (that the capacity of Birkenau crematoria was 20,000 corpses per day!).[\[472\]](#)

Rather, the Holocaust historians sometimes even try to cover the lies of “their” witnesses with other lies, as did for instance R.J. van Pelt with respect to A. Bimko, the Vrba-Wetzler report, or B. Polevoi’s article.[\[473\]](#)

What about verification of sources? Here we have a book of over 300 pages, which not only claims to have refuted all the theses of all the revisionists, but purports to have demonstrated that the alleged Holocaust really happened. The authors generally rely upon secondary sources, as far as testimonies are concerned. The same goes for their documents. Altogether, they cite only four!

Since their published methods impose upon Shermer and Grobman the obligation to verify sources, one would expect they had checked their references. Let’s take a look.

On page 107 they mention *SS-Standartenführer* Paul Blobel in connection with the so-called “Aktion 1005” (more on this in chapter 3.2.3.), for which they cite document PS-3197 (note 20 on page 272), but the correct reference is NO-3947, sworn statement of Paul Blobel dated June 18, 1947.

On page 175, Shermer and Grobman state:

“On November 26, 1945, at the first Nuremberg trial, the Nazi physician Dr. Wilhelm Hoettel [sic] testified [...]”

In reality Wilhelm Höttl never testified at Nuremberg; the authors take for a “testimony” a simple “affidavit” drawn up on November 26, 1945 (Document PS-2738, as they indicate on page 277, note 5).

On page 186 the authors present a passage of a speech by Hans Frank, head of the General Government (occupied Poland) dated October 7, 1940. The reference they give is PS-3363 (note 28 p. 278). But in reality that speech (to which we shall return in chapter 3.7.1.) really occurred on December 20, 1940, and the actual document is PS-2233!

On page 194, Shermer and Grobman state there was a report by Himmler to Hitler dated December 29, 1942, which they reference as “N.D. 1120, prosecution exhibit 237” (note 47 p. 279). But in reality this refers to document NO-511.

This is how Shermer and Grobman respect their obligation to verify their sources!

As an example of their failure to comply with point 4 of their methodic decalogue, we have these authors stating:

“the deniers’ elaborate conspiracy theories about how the Jews have concocted the Holocaust history in order to extract reparations from Germany and support for Israel from Americans.” (p. 249)

Previously Shermer and Grobman had already written that “some deniers” assert that

“there was a conspiracy by Zionists to exaggerate the plight of Jews during the war in order to finance the State of Israel through war reparations.” (p. 106)

As a source for this foolish “tall tale,” to which no revisionist historian would subscribe, Shermer and Grobman present the following in their Note 13 on page 271:

“See P. Rassinier, Debunking the Genocide Myth: A Study of the Nazi Concentration Camps and the Alleged Extermination of European Jewry (Los Angeles, Noontide Press, 1978)” (note 13 on p. 271)

Now that reference does not cite any page because that “tall tale” was invented by the authors. It is nothing other than a passage from the person who wrote the preface to the book, Pierre Hofstetter, who in fact spoke of: [\[474\]](#)

“[...] the entire Zionist establishment which has built the State of Israel on ‘the myth of the six million.’”

That is, the Zionists have taken advantage of, not created, this “myth.”

Concerning Robert Faurisson, Shermer and Grobman present even more dishonesty; on page 100 they write:

“In a 1987 publication, for example, he [Faurisson] claimed that

British Holocaust historian Martin Gilbert had misstated the size of a gas chamber in order to make it fit an eyewitness account of the number of Jews gassed there on a particular occasion. Faurisson failed to take into account the simple fact that eyewitness details may be inadvertently inaccurate (in this case possibly exaggerated) and thus perhaps Gilbert's source was incorrect."

In other words, this is claimed to have been a "blunder" by Faurisson. We verify this according to the teachings of the methodic decalogue of the authors. In a report of May 6, 1945, Kurt Gerstein wrote that from 700 to 800 people were placed into a gas chamber of 25 square meters and 45 cubic meters,[\[475\]](#) which would mean that 28 to 32 persons could occupy a square meter! Here is how Martin Gilbert put this in 1979:[\[476\]](#)

"About seven to eight hundred people in an area of about a hundred square meters." (emphasis added)

Therefore Martin Gilbert did not "misstate" the size of the alleged gas chamber, but falsified the data contained in the original document because it is so absurd. As for the authors, it is precisely they who have made the big "blunder," because, in the first place, they didn't verify Gilbert's source and in the second place they invented the "tall tale" of another source which he used!

Continuing with Shermer's/Grobman's assault against Prof. Faurisson:

"He made a similar blunder over his analysis of the famous Gerstein document. Kurt Gerstein was an SS officer involved in ordering Zyklon-B gas used for both delousing and homicide who, before he died in captivity after the war, gave testimony to the homicidal use of the fumigant. Faurisson and others looked for internal contradictions in his confession, claiming, for example, that the number of victims packed into the gas chambers could not have physically fit. It turns out that Faurisson was basing his estimates on the number of people who fit comfortably into a subway car; others (including deniers) have since disproved his estimates." (pp. 59f.)

The reference is to the book by Pierre Vidal-Naquet, *Assassins of Memory* (1992), 65-74, (Note 65, page 267). In reality, in this book there is not a trace of this silly "tall tale," which has been invented by Shermer and Grobman. Those authors are not even shrewd enough to realize that this is their "blunder" regarding the same passage of the same document of their previous citation! Now, in order to demonstrate the impossibility that in their

presumed gas chamber, where 28 to 32 people were claimed to have been compressed onto each square meter, was there really any need of a comparison with a subway car? Both Martin Gilbert and the Jewish historian Leon Poliakov intuitively understood, so much so that they both falsified the data of Kurt Gerstein![\[477\]](#)

But the methods of the adversaries of revisionism are not aberrant merely in the hermeneutical field. Here are other examples from Shermer and Grobman themselves. They recount that on February 27, 1993, Mark Weber was

“the victim of a Simon Wiesenthal Center sting operation in which the researcher Yaaron Svoray, calling himself Ron Furey, met with Weber in a café to discuss The Right Way, a magazine invented to trick neo-Nazis into identifying themselves.” (pp. 46f.)

Therefore the prestigious Wiesenthal Center is devoted to deceit and lies! By a singular coincidence, one of the authors of *Denying History*, Alex Grobman, is “founding editor-in-chief of the *Simon Wiesenthal Annual*”! (From their own book cover.)

The second case concerns the former Jewish revisionist David Cole. In 1998, Robert J. Newman published an announcement on the web page of the notorious *Jewish Defense League* entitled “David Cole: Monstrous Traitor,” which was formulated as a reward for getting him dead or alive.[\[478\]](#) David Cole understood perfectly (he “was deadly afraid for his life, that someone would find him and shoot him”) and he hastened to retract everything (pp. 72f.).

To the lies and deceit, threats are also added – not from street hooligans, but from two “prestigious” (or notorious?) Jewish associations!

2. The “Convergence of Evidence” of the Gas Chambers

2.1. The Six Levels of “Convergence of Evidence”

In chapter six, concerning mainly Auschwitz, but also including Majdanek and Mauthausen, the authors purport “proving gas chambers and crematoria were used for genocide” (p. 126). They present six elements of proof, which “converge on this conclusion,” as they claim (p. 128).

Let’s examine these “proofs”:

1. *Written documents* – orders for Zyklon B (the trade name of hydrogen cyanide, which is absorbed in gypsum pellets), architectural blueprints,

and orders for building materials for gas chambers and crematoria.

2. *Zyklon B gas traces* [sic!] on the walls of the gas chambers at several camps.
3. *Eyewitness testimony* – survivor testimonies, Jewish *Sonderkommando* diaries, and confessions of guards and commandants.
4. *Ground photographs* – not only of the camps, but also of burning corpses (photos taken secretly and smuggled out of Auschwitz).
5. *Aerial photographs* – indicating prisoners being moved toward gas chamber/crematorium complexes, and matching those of ground photographs corroborating gas chambers and crematoria structures.
5. *The extant ruins of camps* – examined in light of the above sources of evidence (pp. 127f.).

Before refuting these presumed converging proofs regarding Auschwitz, Majdanek and Mauthausen, it is appropriate to explore their nature and their value.

Regarding the orders for Zyklon B, the authors say nothing. They simply limit themselves to repeating the phrase “orders for Zyklon-B gas” (p. 133), which constitutes their “convergence of evidence”! But even if they had articulated their argument better (something they evidently were not in a position to do), this “evidence” can only be glaring nonsense. Since Zyklon B is well known to have been used in all German concentration camps for disinfestation, how could it be deduced from *orders* that this insecticide was used for mass murder?

As an example, getting back to Kurt Gerstein, who was “involved in ordering Zyklon-B gas” (p. 59), he [Gerstein] presented 12 invoices from Degesch in his name concerning the supply of 2,370 kg of Zyklon B from February 16 to May 31, 1944, 1,185 kg for Auschwitz and 1,185 kg for Oranienburg.[\[479\]](#) How can we conclude that the supply of Zyklon B to Auschwitz is “proof” of mass extermination, if no such extermination was practiced at Oranienburg (Sachsenhausen) in homicidal gas chambers using Zyklon B?

The authors say nothing either on “architectural blueprints and orders for building materials for gas chambers and crematoria,” an intentionally deceptive phrase, because it insinuates that *documents* exist concerning homicidal gas chambers, which is false. As for crematorium ovens, there is abundant documentation, but there is no evidence that they were used for the cremation of allegedly gassed persons. Indeed, the contrary conclusion

emerges with certainty from their own study: neither the coke supply nor the life-time of the refractory masonry of the muffles could have allowed the cremation of more than the number of corpses of registered prisoners who died of natural causes,[\[480\]](#) and this is one converging proof of the *absence* of homicidal gas chambers, on which Shermer and Grobman stay tellingly silent. The topic of “Zyklon-B gas traces” will be discussed below.

I have already shown various examples of the way Holocaust historians create “convergence” of testimonies: first of all, by extrapolating single passages from testimonies, keeping quiet about the obvious absurdities they contain, which reduce their credibility and render them unacceptable according to point 2 of our authors’ methodic decalogue. Secondly, they silently pass over the enormous contradictions concerning essential issues, which such testimonies present. We shall see later another case of false “convergence” when we come to “cremation pits.”

The “ground photographs,” including those that show “bodies burning,” do not prove anything regarding alleged mass extermination in homicidal gas chambers, because the practice of burning corpses out in the open at Birkenau was put into effect when the crematoria were temporarily out of service and when there was a lack of coke for running the ovens, as I have demonstrated elsewhere.[\[481\]](#) It is not by accident that Shermer and Grobman have later dropped this “evidence.”

The air photographs shall be examined below. Finally, as for “the extant ruins of the camps,” they demonstrate less than nothing with respect to alleged homicidal gassings, all the more so in view of the authors’ singular ignorance in this respect.

With this now exposed, let us move on to a detailed examination of their “proofs.”

2.2. Auschwitz Gas Chambers

2.2.1. The “Zyklon-B Traces”

The treatment of this “evidence” begins with the Shermer and Grobman paragraph labeled “Zyklon-B Traces” (p. 129). As I have indicated several times, this foolish phrase is a result of ignorance of terminology regarding this issue. Obviously, “Zyklon-B traces” are in reality *cyanide* traces, which is a very different thing. On this topic, the foremost authority – not only among revisionists – is Germar Rudolf, a chemist by profession, and author

of a meticulous scientific study on the “gas chambers” of Auschwitz,[\[482\]](#) which examines the issues of the structures and procedures of the disinfestation systems at Auschwitz (Rudolf’s chapter 5.2.) and the formation and stability of Iron Blue (also known as Prussian Blue or ferric ferrocyanide, chapter 6).

Moreover, Rudolf collected at Birkenau various masonry samples from the disinfesting gas chambers and from the alleged homicidal gas chambers, the chemical analysis of which resulted in a maximum of 13,500 mg/kg for the former (disinfestation chamber of BW 5b) and of 6.7 mg/kg for the latter (*Leichenkeller* or underground morgue 1 of Crematorium II). These results are reported in Rudolf’s chapter 8, together with the results of all previous chemical analyses and a thorough refutation of arguments of the supporters of the existence of homicidal gas chambers.

Now, Shermer and Grobman liquidate this fundamental study with a couple of irrelevant quotations, even deforming the family name of Rudolf, whom they call “Rudolph.” Having to choose between a preliminary study, which unavoidably presented dubious aspects (*The Leuchter Report*[\[483\]](#)) and the essential one, which is unquestionably scientific, Shermer and Grobman concentrated on the former and silently passed over the latter, thus selecting the one that is convenient to their thesis. But even when discussing the *Leuchter Report*, Shermer and Grobman propose arguments, which make anyone minimally informed in this matter wonder about Shermer’s and Grobman’s competence. On page 181 Shermer and Grobman write as follows:

“Faurisson indicates that there are traces of Zyklon-B in general buildings that were fumigated as well as in the gas chambers; so he concludes that traces of Zyklon-B prove nothing about the homicidal use of gas chambers. According to the pharmacist and extermination camp expert Jean-Claude Pressac, however, Faurisson’s defense does not make sense since buildings and morgues are normally disinfected with antiseptics, whether solid (lime, lime chloride), liquid (bleach, cresol), or gas (formaldehyde, sulfur anhydride)” (p. 181, emphasis added)

Well, if there is something here that “does not make sense,” it is just such an answer, because although Faurisson did say “*disinfection* gas chambers,” he clearly meant “*disinfestation* gas chambers,” and with this play on words, these Holocaust historians constructed alleged “confusing evidence”!

In the construction of such “proof” there is no lack of some bad faith,

because, for example, Danuta Czech also uses the term “*Desinfektion*” (disinfection) in *Kalendarium of Auschwitz* to indicate the disinfestation (or delousing) with Zyklon B,[\[484\]](#) but no official historian has ever indicated that this “does not make sense”!

2.2.2. The Presumed Solubility of Iron Blue

On page 182 the authors assert that the ruins of the alleged homicidal gas chambers have been “completely exposed to the elements for over half a century.” Therefore – they insinuate – the Iron Blue which formed on the walls had dissolved. They then bring back an argument by David Cole, who

“[...] acknowledges that the extant ruins have been exposed to the elements but then wonders why Zyklon-B blue staining remains on the outside of the brick gas chamber at Majdanek, against which the Nazis beat clothing and blankets to remove the gas residue.” (p. 132)

The authors comment:

“Wouldn’t these blue stains have washed away in the weather as at Auschwitz? His question sounds reasonable, but when we visited Majdanek we could see that the blue staining on the outside bricks is minimal. Moreover, a roof overhang has protected the bricks from rain and snow, so that the bricks at Majdanek are nowhere near as weathered as the open rubble at Auschwitz.” (p. 132)

It is true that the Iron Blue stains on external walls of two disinfestation chambers situated behind barrack “*Bad und Desinfektion I*” of Majdanek are faint. But it is not only wrong to claim that the Nazis had beaten clothing and blankets on these walls in order to remove gas residuals, it also contradicts the two authors’ own assertion that these two premises “were for the express purpose of gassing prisoners” (p. 163). We shall return to this issue.

It is moreover false that the wall at issue was protected (for decades, according to the authors, otherwise, their point would be dull) by an overhang or canopy. This overhang was in fact already in a state of being dismantled as of the camp’s liberation in July 1944. The wall at issue was therefore already exposed to the elements at war’s end,[\[485\]](#) and so it has remained until today.

But in the response of the authors it is not so much what they say, but rather what they do *not* say that is surprising. They are silent about the fact that right there in Birkenau, a little more than 300 meters from the ruins of Crematoria II and III, on the two external walls (North and South) of the disinfestation gas chambers of building BW 5b immense and intense Iron

Blue stains exist (less so on the walls of the delousing chamber of BW 5a). This was already noted by Pressac, who also photographed them![\[486\]](#) G. Rudolf's comprehensive compilation of evidence proving the extraordinary long-term stability of Iron Blue against environmental influences is met with total silence as well.[\[487\]](#) Therefore the authors not only deliberately hide evidence here, which refutes their untenable hypotheses, but try to confirm them with bogus evidence.

2.2.3. Vanished Doors and "Locks"

On page 132, Shermer and Grobman, anticipating their treatment of the alleged Mauthausen homicidal gas chamber, write:

"When a question or a statement has no grounding in evidence, it becomes just a rhetorical device and requires no answer. Consider, as yet another example, Cole's claim that at Mauthausen the door of the gas chamber does not lock. True, the present door does not lock, but that is irrelevant because it is not the original door. All we had to do to find out that fact was ask."

Subsequently they add that "the gas chamber's original door is now in a museum." (p. 168).

Therefore "the" door to the gas chamber is not original: the original is to be found "in a museum" and to know all about it, all one needs to do is "ask"! As is seen, Shermer and Grobman, who want detailed analysis on the reliability of revisionist sources, bring in an absolutely reliable source: the answer by an unnamed person to their question.

It is also necessary to note that the spirit of observation of the authors is not very sharp, given that even though they visited the alleged gas chamber at Mauthausen (of which they also published one of their photographs), they are not aware of the fact that the room has *two* doors: but then why do they assert that "the door" to the premises is not original? Here is a typical example of an affirmation that "has no grounding in evidence" and therefore becomes "just a rhetorical device"!

A device that moreover reveals the unique ignorance of Shermer and Grobman, as well as of David Cole, who all seriously believe that the gas chamber had a "lock"! In reality, the gas-tight doors had levers closing against angle irons set into the steel frame of the door, such as are quite visible on all the disinfestation chambers at Majdanek. Shermer and Grobman also saw them, and even made a photograph, shown on their page 167, figure

29, but they have understood nothing of their functioning.

2.2.4. The “Reconstruction” of Auschwitz Crematorium I

On page 132, Shermer and Grobman write:

“What about the ‘evidence’ that Cole, Leuchter and Faurisson do present, such as their ‘finding’ that the residue from Zyklon-B in the gas chamber at Crematorium I at Auschwitz (the original camp converted from a Polish army barracks) does not reach a level consistent with extermination? Significantly, they fail to mention in their writings that this building was reconstructed using both original materials and those from other buildings. Who knows what they actually ‘tested’ in their research?”

Here Shermer and Grobman resort to one more “pious” lie: as we know, Crematorium I was never demolished and never reconstructed. The source they cite, the book of Deborah Dwork and Robert Jan van Pelt (note 35 on page 275), says in fact that yes, Crematorium I was “reconstructed,” but explains that this refers to a presumed restoration to the original state with the reconstruction of the chimney, of two crematorium ovens, and with the realization of four openings for the introduction of Zyklon B through the roof of the mortuary chamber (the alleged gas chamber),[\[488\]](#) which was never destroyed. In order to keep people from discovering these “pious” falsehoods, the authors then committed a “pious error” by citing the reference to that work as “pp. 274 to 278” instead of p. 364!

2.2.5. An Original “Gas Chamber” – Although Reconstructed!

And here the final pseudo-reasoning, as worthy a conclusion as those previously:

“David Cole, in his documentary of his visit to Auschwitz, dramatically proclaims that he got the museum director to ‘confess’ that the gas chamber was a reconstruction and thus a ‘lie’ thrust upon an unwitting public. We see this as classic denier hyperbole and ideological flag waving. No one at Auschwitz – from the guides to the director – denies that the gas chamber there is a reconstruction. A visitor has only to ask.” (p. 133)

This may even be true if it refers to the time when the authors visited the

camp towards the end of the 1990s, but it was not true in 1992, when David Cole went to Auschwitz. Naturally Shermer and Grobman know this very well, because in the documentary video at issue, Cole did not do anything other than to “ask” a guide, by the name of Alicia. Here are the essential parts of their conversation:[\[489\]](#)

“Here, in front of the gas chamber, I asked Alicia about the authenticity of that building.

Cole: Now, let’s start again talking about this building here.

Alicia: This is a crematorium/gas chamber.

Cole: But this is a reconstruction?

Alicia: It is in [its] original state.

Now there Alicia has very clearly represented the gas chamber as being in its original state. Once inside, I asked her specifically about the holes in the ceiling.

Cole: Are these the original four holes in the ceiling?

Alicia: It is original. Through this chimney was dropped Zyklon B.”

Already in 1995, Krystyna Oleksy, civil employee of the director of the Museum, declared to journalist Eric Conan on the subject of the presumed gas chamber:[\[490\]](#)

“For the time being, we leave it as it is and we don’t tell visitors. It’s too complicated.”

This means the guides *were ordered* not to tell visitors that the premises were (poorly) restructured, in order to make people believe that it is a homicidal gas chamber in its original state! Here we are not facing a “classic denier hyperbole,” but a classic disingenuous argument of Shermer and Grobman.

2.2.6. Documents

Let us now move on to the alleged “corroboration” by documents and ground photographs (p. 131). The authors bring up the famous letter of January 29, 1943, from “Sturmbannführer” (Major) Bischoff to “Heinz” Kammler (p. 137). Karl Bischoff was head of Central Construction Office of the Waffen-SS and Police Auschwitz, but he held the rank – indicated in the letter[\[491\]](#) – of SS-*Hauptsturmführer* (Captain), while Kammler, head of Office Gruppe C of SS-WVHA, had the first name Hans.

They then quote a section of text from the letter, in which the German word *Öfen* (ovens) is rendered as “furnaces.” At this point the authors,

instead of examining the original document, have relied on a second-hand source: Gerald Reitlinger (note 38 on p. 275).

As far as the term “*Vergasungskeller*”[\[492\]](#) is concerned, which they translate as “gassing cellar,” even Jean-Claude Pressac opined that it is “irresponsible” to assert that it designates a homicidal gas chamber as such, because:[\[493\]](#)

“though ‘gas chamber’ was correct, there was no proof that it was ‘homicidal.’”

On p. 137, the authors write:

“On March 6, 1943, Bischoff refers to a gas-tight door for Crematorium III, similar to that of Crematorium II, which was to include a peephole of thick glass.”

Actually, the original[\[494\]](#) is dated March 31, 1943. The authors show only a portion of it, but falsify the translation of the term “*Leichenkeller I*” (underground morgue 1) which becomes simply “cellar I.” The source given in note 39 on p. 275 is J.-C. Pressac’s first study of Auschwitz, which shows the original documents.[\[495\]](#)

At the end, the authors comment:

“Why would they need a peephole with thick glass if all that was happening in this room was the delousing of clothing? Although in itself the existence of the peephole does not ‘prove’ anything, it is one more finding that dovetails with the idea that these chambers were used for killing people.” (p. 137)

That fallacious conclusion is squarely refuted by the very book from which they obtained the document mentioned. Pressac has, in fact, published a photograph of a gas-tight door of the disinfestation chamber using hydrogen cyanide at the so-called *Kanada I* delousing and storage barracks complex, BW 28, “*Entlausungs- und Effektenbaracken*,” with this comment:[\[496\]](#)

“The gas-tight door of the Kanada I delousing gas chamber. Its construction, by the DAW [= Deutsche Ausrüstungswerke], is very rudimentary. It has peephole, a handle to open it [...]”

Pressac even shows an enlargement of this peep-hole.[\[497\]](#) And a peep-hole was also set in the gas-tight door of the disinfestation chamber of Block 1 at the Auschwitz camp, of which Pressac presents six photographs.[\[498\]](#) According to the regulations in effect in Germany during these times, it was prohibited to enter a delousing room without a companion. Who ever entered such a room, had to be observed by at least one person, who can come to the

rescue in case of an emergency. This explains why delousing chamber doors had peep holes.[\[499\]](#)

Thus, the authors here not only violated their own methodic rules by exclusively looking only for confirmatory evidence, but they deliberately ignored evidence that refutes their erroneous conclusions by selecting from Pressac's book only those parts which fit in with their theses!

2.2.7. "Eyewitness Accounts"

A further convergent "proof" comes from "eyewitnesses to mass murder" (p. 137). The authors mention the famous "confession" of Pery Broad – which he drew up on July 13, 1945, and handed over to the British Intelligence Services – and state:

"In April 1959 Broad was called to testify at a trial of captured Auschwitz SS members and acknowledged the authorship of the memoir, confirmed its validity, and retracted nothing." (p. 137)

But at the Frankfurt Auschwitz trial, Broad declared:[\[500\]](#)

"In 1945, I wrote a report on Auschwitz and handed it to the English at the British camp of Munsterlager. There, a copy of my report was made. I have glanced through the photocopy presented to me here. Some sections are mine; some sections may have been added by others, some sections, finally, are false. I am surprised that such things should stem from me."

After reading the report, Broad said:[\[501\]](#)

"I recognize individual portions as being unmistakably mine, but not the document in its entirety."

It is certainly true that Broad recognized as authentic those portions of the report that speak of gassings,⁵¹ but if he had ventured to question the authenticity of those portions, he faced the possibility of a much harsher sentence.[\[502\]](#)

According to the authors, revisionist historians have noticed that the duration of a homicidal gassing was four minutes for Broad and twenty minutes for Höss and conclude, surprisingly but true, that

"because of such discrepancies, deniers dismiss Broad's account entirely." (p. 138)

In fact, this document is considered of doubtful value even by such people as Pierre Vidal-Naquet and Jean-Claude Pressac. The former has written:[\[503\]](#)

“In the documentation on Auschwitz there are statements which give the impression of adopting entirely the language of the victors. This is the case, for example, of SS-man Pery Broad who, in 1945, drew up for the English a memorandum on Auschwitz where he had been active as a member of the Politische Abteilung, i.e. of the Gestapo. He speaks of himself in the third person.”

And Pressac notes:[\[504\]](#)

“Historically, this account is not exploitable in its present version, despite its ‘true’ and all too ‘striking’ atmosphere, since it has been rewritten by and for the Poles and diffused exclusively by them.”

Pressac then states that the Auschwitz Museum is not in possession of the original and that nobody knows where it is. In his second book on Auschwitz, Pressac asserts:[\[505\]](#)

“[P. Broad] gave himself up to the English in May [1945] and started to work for them. On the basis of his recollections he drew up a report on Auschwitz, the strange format of which is said to have been suggested to him by a Pole in London who had been in touch with him at Munsterlager. Released in 1947, he continued to work for the English. He blamed everyone else to save his own skin, testified at Nuremberg and at Hamburg in the trial of Bruno Tesch.”

The authors, hence, who (rightly) demand from the revisionist historians the reliability of their sources, base themselves in this case on a document, of which no one has ever seen the original, which is written in an apologetically Polish style, and which is recognized even by its presumed author as having been somewhat altered. But for Shermer and Grobman, this is a reliable source!

Then, the authors move on to the convergent “proof” of Rudolf Höss’ “confessions.” They claim:[\[506\]](#)

“Höss made his statement on April 5, 1946, probably unaware of Pery Broad’s memoir (and vice versa).” (p. 139, emphasis added)

They tell us that

“after Höss was found guilty and sentenced to death, he wrote a 250-page autobiographical manuscript that corroborates both his previous testimony and Broad’s statement.” (p. 139)

In fact, the sentence in the Höss trial was pronounced on April 2, 1947, and he was executed on April 16, but his notes date from the period between November 1946, and February 1947. It is really unbelievable that the authors

should be unaware of such basic dates in the historiography of the holocaust.

They then forget to relate that Höss had already made a first “confession,” to the English, with reference to which, in his notes written while in Polish custody, he states:[507]

“My first interrogation ended in a confession, given the persuasive arguments used against me. I do not know what the statement contains, although I did sign it. But alcohol and the whip were too much, even for me.”

Martin Broszat, the editor of the original German version of Höss’ notes, mentions in a footnote:

“It is a typescript of 8 pages which Höss signed on March 14, 1946 (Nuremberg Document NO-1210). As far as the contents are concerned, it does not materially differ in any point from what Höss declared or wrote at Nuremberg or Krakow.”

Therefore, the first “confession” made by Höss, the one which contains the essential elements of all later “confessions,” was formulated by his English interrogators!

The authors forget, furthermore, to present another argument at variance with their thesis: The fact that Höss was tortured by the English has now been historically verified,[508] having been admitted even by his torturer (Bernard Clarke) and accepted as true by J.-C. Pressac (“arrested by the English in March, 1946, he was violently beaten and ill-treated several times, almost to death”)[509] and by Fritjof Meyer (“after three sleepless nights, tortured, whipped after every answer, naked and forced to drink alcohol [...]”).[510]

Finally, the authors refer to the diary of Dr. Johann Paul Kremer (p. 139) whose “*Sonderaktionen*” (special actions) – as I have explained elsewhere[511] – have nothing to do with exterminations. The authors draw attention to the fact that “at the trial of the Auschwitz camp garrison in Krakow in December 1947” Dr. Kremer clarified that “*Sonderaktion*” meant homicidal gassing. They show part of Dr. Kremer’s interrogation, which did not take place “in December” of 1947 but on August 18.

Already in the indictment (*akt oskarżenia*) at the initiation of the trial of the camp garrison of the Auschwitz camp, the Prosecutor of the People’s Supreme Tribunal of Warsaw had established that “*Sonderaktion*” was synonymous with gassing:[512]

“During his brief stay at Auschwitz, the accused Kremer took part 14 times in assassinations (gassings). Between 2 and 28 September he

participated in 9 similar ‘Sonderaktionen.’”

Under the circumstances, if Dr. Kremer had dared to object to the prosecution’s view, he would have been considered an inveterate Nazi criminal, condemned to death and executed. Kremer chose to help the prosecution, and it was a winning gamble: he was inevitably condemned to death (he had participated in the “selection” of detainees) but pardoned and released in 1958.

And this is the surprising conclusion of the authors:

“The convergence of the accounts from Broad, Höss and Kremer is additional proof that the Nazis used gas chambers and crematoria for mass extermination.” (p. 140)

Hence, a report written or manipulated by the British Secret Service and by the Poles, of which no one has ever seen the original, “confessions” drawn up by the British Secret Service and imposed by torture, and finally admissions already incorporated into an indictment by the Polish prosecution of a Stalinist show trial and opportunistically taken over by a defendant constitute, for the authors, “converging proofs” – a most incredible statement!

In matters of “convergence,” the authors state that the revisionist historians

“still have the problem of explaining why the two accounts coincide so well.” (p. 139)

Leaving aside the fact that the two testimonies are far from “coinciding so well,” it would not really be a “problem” should they coincide with their claim that mass exterminations were carried out in gas chambers at Auschwitz.

Already during the war the British Secret Service was aware of the fanciful reports by various Polish resistance movements, which came to the attention of the Secret Service of the *Delegatura* (the secret agents in Poland of the Polish government in exile in London). Immediately after the end of the war, various national commissions for the investigation of NS war crimes were set up, and the first sketches of the story of exterminations at Auschwitz began to emerge.

Furthermore, the report of the Soviet investigation commission on Auschwitz appeared in *Pravda* on May 7, 1945, and at the same day in an English translation entitled “The Oswiecim Murder-Camp.”[\[513\]](#) Thus, the British Secret Service also possessed this source, which at that time

constituted the best guide to what the captured Nazis had to “confess.”[\[514\]](#)

This is the real reason for the “convergence” of the accounts by Broad and Höss with respect to the alleged homicidal gassings at Auschwitz!

2.2.8. Air Photos

The authors then move on to another alleged element of proof, the air reconnaissance photographs which, according to them, as we have seen above, “corroborate the structure of the gas chambers and crematoria.”

Nothing could be farther from the truth, as far as the “structure of the gas chambers” is concerned.

The authors publish a series of photographs to substantiate their claim of a “convergence of proof” of the alleged extermination, but these pictures do not really demonstrate anything at all. Let us look at the more important ones, starting with number 16 of the series.

“This aerial photograph from August 25, 1944, shows the distinct features of Crematorium II (including the long shadow from the chimney) and the adjacent gas chamber (bottom center, at a right angle to the crematorium). On the roof of the gas chamber, note the four staggered shadows, openings through which the Zyklon-B pellets could be poured, as described in eyewitness accounts.” (p. 145)

As has already been noted by other authors,[\[515\]](#) on the photograph of August 25, 1944, the spots on the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II are some 3 to 4 meters long, those on the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium III cover an area of at least 3 square meters; the alleged introduction chimneys for Zyklon B, however, are claimed to have stood only some 40 to 50 cm[\[516\]](#) above the concrete surface of the roof. On the other hand, the smokestack of crematorium II, which was about 16 m high, casts a shadow of about 20 m on the ground, therefore the alleged chimneys for Zyklon B would, likewise, have cast a shadow some 60 cm long.

But that is not all. All the spots have an axis running north-south, whereas the shadow of the smokestack runs northeast-southwest. Finally, in the air photo taken on May 31, 1944, there is only one spot on the western edge of the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II.[\[517\]](#)

The interpretation of the four spots as Zyklon B introduction openings is so inconsistent that one of the best specialists for this aspect among the supporters of the reality of the gas chambers, Charles D. Provan, has written:
[\[518\]](#)

“No matter what one thinks of the authenticity of the smudgy marks, it is impossible to view them, whether authentic or not, as ‘vents.’”

Let us move on to Shermer’s and Grobman’s photograph 17, still on p. 145:

“Note two sides of the rectangular underground gas chamber structure that protrudes a few feet above the ground, directly below the chimney of Crematorium II. On the gas chamber roof are four small structures that match the shaded markings in the aerial photographs in figure 16.”

Such a “coincidence” exists only in the fantasy of the authors. As Jean-Marie Boisdefeu has shown by means of a diagram, the objects appearing on the roof of the alleged gas chamber are three and not four in number (the fourth was outside its surface) and all three are grouped together in the southern half of the roof, which is in disagreement with the location of the spots in the photograph of August 25, 1944, as well as with the testimonies. [\[519\]](#) Hence, the three objects are not introduction chimneys for Zyklon B.

Charles D. Provan, too, has come to this conclusion, drawing his own diagram on the photograph with the result that: [\[520\]](#)

“the objects are therefore not poison gas chimneys.”

I have since dealt with this question in a specific article, which demonstrates that the alleged introduction chimneys have never existed and which also refutes, among other things, the alleged discoveries by Daniel Keren, Jamie McCarthy and Harry W. Mazal. [\[521\]](#)

Shermer’s photograph 18 on p. 146 shows the unloading of deported Hungarian Jews from a train. Photographs 19 and 20 (pp. 147f.) are enlargements of three air photos taken in rapid succession on August 25, 1944. The two reproductions of photograph 19 are reversed! A group of persons is moving between BW5a and 5b (on the left) and the two kitchen barracks in front along the line separating sectors BIa and BIb of Birkenau (but the authors do not know elementary things like that).

The column moves along the road, which ran through sector BII of the camp in an east-west direction. Therefore they had to have BW 5a and 5b on their right and the kitchens on their left. On the photographs in question, it is the opposite. Therefore they are shown mirror-reversed.

Photograph 20 shows, on three images, three groups of persons walking along the eastern edge of sector BIa: one group is between barrack 27 and the camp fence, another group walks along the road between barracks 24 – 30 (on the right) and 22 – 28 (on the left), a third group is partly walking parallel

to the second and partly along the curve to the right between barracks 24 – 30. Of course, the authors do not realize this, just as they do not know that the three images are printed the wrong way around with respect to all Birkenau plans, i.e. with the crematoria at the bottom and the eastern fence at the top.

All these photographs demonstrate nothing more than the fact that columns of detainees were moving around at Birkenau.

Photograph 21 (p. 149) is, however, interpreted by the authors in a more pretentious way:

“Finally, figure 21 appears to be a group of people moving toward Crematorium V, offering yet another evidence that indicates the reality of mass murder (see also figure 22).” (p. 146)

We notice immediately that these two images, too, have been printed upside down with respect to the Birkenau plans: crematoria IV and V appear at the bottom rather than at the top. What is more serious, however, and almost incredible is that the authors confuse crematorium V with crematorium IV! It is necessary to turn the book upside down to re-establish the normal orientation with crematoria IV and V at the top and the “*Effektenlager*” (the so-called *Kanada*) on the left.

Areas enclosed by a rectangle on the two images show a column of people. This column was on the road which separated the “*Effektenlager*” (on the left) from crematorium IV (on the right), in front of barracks 2 – 8 to be precise. On the right, the road ran along a copse of birch-trees, located to the west of crematorium V, in which there was a fire-protection basin.

Contrary to what the authors think, this photograph proves absolutely nothing with respect to the “reality of mass murder.” If they had gone into the matter a little more deeply, the authors would have known that the so-called Auschwitz Album even shows persons under the trees, near the basin.[\[522\]](#)

I have already shown elsewhere that the hypothesis that these people were waiting to be gassed is not in any way more convincing than the one that they were waiting to depart from the camp (as might be shown by the fact that they had with them heavy backpacks, bags, and cooking utensils).[\[523\]](#)

In her memoirs, Elisa Springer, who was deported to Auschwitz in early August 1944, describes what happened after they left the train:

“Once we had reached an area with some grass on the edge of a birch-wood, we had to lie down and we stayed there all night, trembling, and in the mud. [...] In the early morning, some SS-men arrived with several detainees in their striped uniforms and ordered us to get up on the double

and to leave the copse.”

Then Dr. Mengele separated those fit for work from the unfit and the former (among them Elisa Springer) were led to the *Zentralsauna* for a bath and delousing.[524] The witness does not say that those unfit were “gassed,” she only allows it to be understood, but then this tale is part of the basic equipment of the witnesses, in the same way as the tale of the chimneys spouting flames.[525]

Figure 22 on p. 150 represents, according to the authors, crematorium V “with the gas chambers at the far end of the building,” whereas it actually shows crematorium IV, seen from the west. Of course, the claim that the photograph shows gas chambers at all does not result from the image which, as such, does not prove anything.

2.2.9. Interpreting Air Photos

The authors then dedicate a section to “interpreting the air photos” (p. 150), in which they again show an astonishing lack of knowledge regarding even the most elementary facts of holocaust history. They affirm that, in May of 1944, as a preparation for the deportation to Auschwitz of “half a million Jews” (to be precise, the number of deportees was 437,402 of whom at least 39,000 were deported to places other than Auschwitz[526]), Werner Jothann, “SS-Obersturmführer (Lieutenant Colonel[527]),” ordered *inter alia* the installation of “elevators in Crematoria II and III to move the bodies from the gas chamber to the crematoria” (pp. 150f.), which is, however refuted by their most important source.[528]

They claim, furthermore, that the air photos cannot show proof of the alleged extermination for the following reason:

“The undressing, gassing, and cremation were all done inside the crematoria buildings. It was highly unlikely that an Allied plane would have flown over at the same time as smoke was coming out of chimneys or from an open-pit burning.” (p. 151, emphasis added)

To refresh the memories of the authors, the official picture of the alleged extermination of the Hungarian Jews, drawn up by one of their principal sources, Franciszek Piper, is the following:[529]

“For example, in the initial stages of the extermination of Hungarian Jews, crematorium V had to be shut down due to a breakdown of the chimneys. As a result, some bodies were incinerated in crematorium IV. The remainder was burned at the rate of about 5,000 corpses in 24 hours

in the incineration pits of bunker 2, which was reactivated in the spring of 1944.”

The witnesses' statements, though, are even more devastating. During the deportation phase of the Hungarian Jews there existed in the north yard of crematorium V five “cremation trenches” according to Tauber[530] and Müller (the latter gives the dimensions of two of them as 40-50×8 m),[531] three trenches according to Bendel (12×6 m),[532] whereas for Nyiszli no such trenches ever existed.

The so-called “Bunker 2” had four gas chambers and four cremation trenches for Müller,[533] whereas Nyiszli[534] has no gas chambers but only two cremation trenches some 50 × 6 m, in which 5,600 to 6,000 corpses were burned each day. Again, we have here an excellent example of converging evidence!

To sum up, during the period in question there should have existed (and be visible on the air photos) three or four “cremation trenches” in the north yard of crematorium V and 2 or 4 trenches in the area of the so-called “Bunker 2” (outside the camp, at some 200 m to the west of the *Zentralsauna*).

The authors tell us that they addressed themselves “to Dr. Nevin Briant, supervisor of Cartographic Applications and Image Processing Applications at NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California (operated by the California Institute of Technology)” and had him analyze the air photos of Birkenau “by digital technology,” adding:

“The photographic negatives were converted to digital data in the computer, then enhanced with software programs used by NASA for aerial and satellite imaging.” (p. 143)

However, in spite of all this sophisticated technology, the authors say nothing about the presence of *mass* “cremation trenches” in the air photos, whereas they did devote seven enlargements to proving the presence of columns of marching persons in the camp!

It is obvious that the NASA experts did not find any trace of such trenches, for otherwise the authors would have pounced on such an opportunity to publish enlargements as “converging evidence” for the alleged exterminations carried out at Auschwitz.

Actually, on the photographs of May 31, 1944, a smoking area does indeed appear in the north yard of crematorium V, but it is *a single* smoking area with a surface of only 40 to 50 square meters!

However, as I have previously demonstrated in the article “Supplementary Response to John C. Zimmerman on his ‘Body disposal at Auschwitz’”³¹ already mentioned, if the thesis of the mass extermination of Hungarian Jews were true, there should appear on the photographs of May 31, 1944 – in view of the impossibility of burning the corpses in the crematoria – cremation trenches having a total surface area of some 7,600 square meters, as opposed to the 40-50 m² that can effectively be seen!

From this we can see clearly why the authors have opted for keeping quiet with respect to the “cremation trenches.” It is impossible that the minute area with smoke in the yard of crematorium V should have escaped the attention of the NASA experts. Yet they did not mention it anyway. The photographs of May 31, 1944, do not only refute the testimonies but also the objective reality of the alleged mass extermination of the Hungarian Jews.

As we have seen above (p. 179), if that extermination were true, some 9,500 corpses would have had to be burned *in the open* between May 16 and 31, 1944! The authors, who do not know or act as if they do not know such data, refer to the *Auschwitz Kalendarium* and claim that on May 31 a single convoy of Jews arrived at Auschwitz, of whom only 100 were selected for work while the others were gassed, and comment:

“For this day we do not know how many Jews were killed in the gas chambers, what time they were killed, or if they were cremated that day or the next day.” (p. 152)

They forget about the second transport of Hungarian Jews registered in the *Kalendarium*, from which 2,000 deportees were registered and the remainder “murdered in the gas chambers.”[\[535\]](#) They go on to add a totally incredible explanation:

“It is reported that between May 16 and May 31 the SS acquired eighty-eight pounds of gold and white metal from false teeth, so it is possible that bodies were not cremated until after this process was completed, which would have been after May 31 for those arriving that day.” (p. 152)

For this, the authors give no source, and that is quite understandable. This item of information stems, in fact, from one of their main sources in which one can read:[\[536\]](#)

“According to a secret report smuggled out of the camp at the start of the extermination of Hungarian Jews in May 1944, the SS took delivery of 40 kg (80 pounds) of gold and ‘white metal’ (probably platinum).”

Hence, it is an arbitrary conclusion on the part of the authors that the alleged booty of precious metal (for which there exists no document) was brought in “between May 16 and May 31.” If they had checked their source in accordance with their methodic decalogue, they would have noticed that the report in question is dated June 15, 1944, and refers to the period of May 25 to June 15, 1944.[\[537\]](#)

Thus, the trickery of the authors failed to impress us. But even assuming that the story of the teeth were true and that the period were the one indicated by the authors, how could anyone seriously deduce from the extraction of the teeth that the corpses were not burned until May 31? With what distorted logic can anyone believe that the corpses were not burned by and by as the teeth were removed, which is, after all, exactly what the official historiography claims to have been the case?[\[538\]](#) In the face of such logic, the authors’ claim of using “the accepted rules of reason” rings decidedly hollow.

According to the documents regarding the deportation of the Hungarian Jews, 33,187 of them were deported between May 28 and 31. This figure is the difference between the 217,236 deported up to May 31[\[539\]](#) and the 184,049 deported up to May 28.[\[540\]](#)

As I have shown elsewhere,[\[541\]](#) there are two possibilities for the arrivals at Auschwitz on the days that concern us here: either 12,900 Jews, in round figures, arrived on May 30 and 9,050 arrived on the 31st, or vice versa. In the case most favorable to the authors, we have 9,050 arrivals for May 31, with some 8,200 ($= 9,050 \times 0.91$) gassed and burned.

As the theoretical maximum capacity of the Birkenau crematoria (assuming that baby bodies were cremated as well) stood at 1,040 corpses in 24 hours,[\[542\]](#) it follows that on May 31, some 7,150 corpses would have been burned in the open air. On May 30, about 11,700 ($= 12,900 \times 0.91$) Jews are claimed to have been murdered, with about 10,700 of them burned in the open air.

To burn the average daily number of corpses, 9,500, by applying Müller’s absurd method, one would have needed an area of about $(9,500 \times 320 \div 1,200 =)$ roughly 2,500 square meters!

Looking once more at the photograph of May 31, 1944, if the story of the extermination of the Hungarian Jews were true, the image should show the following *permanent* elements:

- at least 2,500 square meters of “cremation trenches”

- at least 5,000 cubic meters of earth removed during the digging of the trenches[543]
- at least 1,800 tons[544] of wood for the corpses to be burned on May 31, without counting the reserve for the following days.

But what do these photographs actually show? If we follow the authors, they show only columns of people marching in the camp! Beyond that, there is only the “smoking gun” of an area 40 – 50 m² in size, which they prefer not to mention.

This tiny area is 50 times smaller than what would have been needed according to the false statements of the witnesses, and over 180 times smaller than what would really have been required for burning such an enormous quantity of corpses in the open air!

Here we have, then, another good example of “converging evidence” *against* mass extermination, about which the authors preferred to remain silent.

Let us read on. On p. 159, the authors present a photograph showing a section of the roof, made of reinforced concrete, of morgue 1 (the alleged gas homicidal chamber) of crematorium II at Birkenau, saying:

“The extant hole in what remains of the gas chamber may be one of the openings through which the SS guards poured Zyklon-B gas pellets.”

Actually, as I have demonstrated in two specific studies of this aspect, this gap has nothing to do with the alleged Zyklon B introduction openings *which never existed*.¹⁹

2.2.10. Himmler’s Visit to Auschwitz

I will conclude this section with another one of those false “convergent proofs,” which the authors have adopted:

“Gassings began in 1941, and Himmler witnessed his first gassing on July 18, 1942.” (p. 150)

Here we have another classical example of incestuous sources! The claim that Himmler witnessed a homicidal gassing at Auschwitz on July 18, 1942, is based solely on Rudolf Höss’ “testimony,” and we have already seen how it was extorted from him and what value it has.

Even though the authors, justly, require of revisionist historians a scrupulous verification of the sources and the search for evidence against their own theses, in this case, much like most others, neither they nor any other official historian has ever gone to the trouble of verifying Höss’

assertion: he said something useful for the common cause of the holocaust, thus everyone is happy.

There exist, however, several documents – starting with Himmler’s own diary – which allow us to check the truth. And the truth is that Himmler not only did not witness any homicidal gassing, but could not even have done so, because the schedule of his visit to Auschwitz is in absolute disagreement with any schedule for the arrival of Jewish transports at Auschwitz and alleged homicidal gassings![\[545\]](#)

2.3. Gas Chambers at Majdanek

The authors dedicate a section to “the contingent history of Majdanek” (p. 161f.), in which they deal with the alleged homicidal gas chambers of this camp. Of course, they completely ignore the study on Majdanek, which I have written together with Jürgen Graf[\[546\]](#) and in which we have devoted a long chapter[\[547\]](#) – since 2000 also available in English[\[548\]](#) – to this topic, demonstrating on the basis of documents that the alleged gas chambers were planned and built as a “disinfestation installation using the hydrogen cyanide disinfestation system” (*Entwesungsanlage nach dem System der Blausäure-Entwesung*)[\[549\]](#) and that they were never used as homicidal gas chambers.[\[550\]](#)

Without a precise knowledge of the installations it may not be possible to understand the arguments of the authors and my replies, hence I shall first set out the essential data for the alleged gas chambers at Majdanek on the basis of the Polish-Soviet expertise dated August 4-23, 1944:

Number	Location and designation	Dimensions	Area m ²
Chamber I	Barrack 41, located in SE	4.50 m × 3.80 m	17.1
Chamber II	Barrack 41, located in NE	4.50 m × 3.80 m	17.1
Chamber III	Barrack 41, <i>Entlausungskammer</i> in W	9.27 m × 3.80 m	35.2
Chamber IV	Barrack 4, <i>Gaskammer</i> , adjacent to shower room		107.7
Chamber V	Barrack 28, drying room	11.75 m × 6 m	70.5
Chamber	Barrack 28, drying room	11.75 m × 6	70.5

VI		m	
Chamber	Crematorium, housed between	6.10 m × 5.62	34.9
VII	mortuary and autopsy room	m	

Chamber VII was located in the crematorium. Jean-Claude Pressac has written in this respect that the assistant director of the Museum had told him that this gas chamber “was used very little, really very little.” According to the French historian this “means, plainly speaking, that it was not used at all.”[\[551\]](#)

In order to make people believe that this was indeed a homicidal gas chamber, the Poles had opened up a rough rectangular aperture in the roof without any closure and even without cutting the steel rebars of the concrete!
[\[552\]](#)

The authors leave that room aside and start their journey with the two rooms of barrack 28 (chambers V and VI), writing:

“The first two gas chambers, which apparently used both Zyklon-B and carbon monoxide, were built in the middle of the camp, near a laundry and crematorium, and housed in a wooden shack.” (p. 162)

The information is taken from Pressac’s article mentioned above. However, its author arrived at a quite different conclusion:¹⁰¹

“It is likely that these two makeshift gas chambers were used for disinfecting clothing with Zyklon B (hydrocyanic acid). The laundry, located nearby, is another argument in favor of this interpretation.”

The authors then quote an “analysis” by the historian Michael Tregenza who affirms that these chambers “used both HCN [Zyklon-B] and CO [carbon monoxide] gas, although this has not been officially confirmed,” but concludes:

“Current theory, however, tends to favor these chambers as disinfection facilities only [...]” (p. 162)

The authors comment:

“But this theory does not explain the use of carbon monoxide, which is useless against lice. Its only plausible use is against human beings.” (p. 162)

In fact, there is no document and no witness statement on the use of those two rooms for homicidal purposes. According to the witnesses, executions were carried out by striking the victims in the back of the neck with an iron bar in a suitable room of the crematorium.

On the other hand, according to the Holocaust historians, carbon mon-

oxide was never used in chambers V and VI, but only Zyklon B. In the most complete exterminationist work on the Majdanek camp, Czeslaw Rajca, who deals with the “direct extermination” of the detainees, devotes a single line (!) to chambers V and VI, claiming that prior to October of 1941, “the detainees were murdered with Zyklon B in a gas chamber made of wood, which was located near the bath [actually it was the laundry].”[553]

Even though a Polish-Soviet Investigative Commission had been concluded that this room in barrack 28 served as a drying room for the laundry nearby, this commission invented the story of homicidal gassings in this room by concluding that “in reality” the two rooms were homicidal gas chambers because of the presence of two ventilation chimneys with lids on the roof for the removal of the warm air! The two chimneys immediately became Zyklon B introduction openings, as is shown by the legend of the well-known photograph of a Soviet soldier in front of one of them holding the lid in his hand.[554]

Shermer and Grobman admit that chamber IV, which was located in the barrack presently labeled “*Bad und Desinfektion*,” was not a homicidal gas chamber:

“The original block measures 9.2 meters by 3.62 meters by 2.05 meters high. Casual inspection of the large gas chamber room shows that its use was for delousing clothing and blankets, not for mass extermination, since the doors to it open in, they do not (and cannot) lock, and there is a large glass window (about 30 by 60 centimeters, or 1 by 2 feet) that could easily be broken. The

window frame appears to be original, since the wood from which it is constructed is saturated with blue Zyklon-B stains (as is the rest of the room).” (p. 162)

However, as late as 1997, a sign in five languages in this room asserted:
[556]

“Eksperimental [sic] gas chamber for exterminating prisoners with cyclone B thrown into the chamber through holes in the ceiling.”



Michael Shermer[555]

If a “casual inspection” is enough to convince anyone that this room was never used as a homicidal gas chamber, why has it been bandied about for decades as a homicidal gas chamber?

Furthermore, the arguments used by the authors had already been expounded by me – in a much more cogent way – in 1998. In the study of Majdanek mentioned above, I had in fact published the plans and documents concerning the gas chambers and explained the results of an on-site inspection, including the fact that the window frame showed traces of Iron Blue.^[557] Being that of a “negationist,” my demonstration was completely ignored, obviously, whereas the explanations of the authors – superficial and partly in error as they are^[558] – will no doubt be accepted as God’s truth.

Thus, only chambers I, II, and III of the installation to the east of barrack “*Bad und Desinfektion*” remain as potential homicidal gas chambers. The authors say:

“The SS then built the two smaller concrete gas chambers with iron doors (in the back of the building and at that time separate from the other rooms), and these additions, we believe, were for the express purpose of gassing prisoners. Why else would the SS have built these new rooms that featured peepholes and locking doors, components not found in any delousing chamber? [...] Finally, we know that carbon monoxide was employed in the Bad und Desinfektion I gas chambers, pointing to their use for mass homicide.” (p. 163)

A few pages further along, the authors, commenting on photograph 29 on p. 167 of their book (it is chamber III, the one on the left, coming from the barrack “*Bad und Desinfektion*”), write the following:

“The latter includes a locking steel door with peephole and gas detector, and the room itself contains floor-to-ceiling Zyklon-B staining.”

Speaking of this chamber and its companion, Tregenza notes:

“These two chambers were adapted yet again for use with CO gas, which can only be used for extermination purposes – CO is useless for disinfection purposes, and is fatal only for warm-blooded animals. What we are looking at, then, is a chamber where people, not clothes, were gassed.” (p. 165)

So now here we are, at last, in front of two allegedly real homicidal gas chambers! Reality, though, is quite different. Contrary to what the authors believe – who rely on misbegotten sources in this case more than ever, something they always blame others for doing – the installation in question

was planned and built as a disinfestation unit.

The original project, of which a later drawing has been preserved – the drawing by the Construction Office of the POW camp Lublin (Majdanek) with the title “*Entwesungsanlage. Bauwerk XII^A*” (disinfestation unit, building XIIA) dated August 1942 – shows a rectangular block measuring 10.76 m × 8.64 m × 2.45 m housing two disinfestation chambers (*Entlausungskammern*) 10 m × 3.75 m × 2 (height) meters, each with two doors 0.95 by 1.80 meters facing each other in such a way that each of the smaller sides of the building showed two doors placed side by side, 3 meters apart.[\[559\]](#)

Let us briefly review the beginnings of this unit:

- May 27, 1942: Amt IIB of WVHA requests an *Entwesungsanlage* (disinfestation plant) for “*Bekleidungswerk Lublin*” (Lublin garment works).
- June 19, 1942: Chief of the Central Construction Inspection of the SS-WVHA, *SS-Sturmbannführer* Lenzer, passes on to the Construction Inspection of the Waffen-SS and Police Government General (occupied Poland) the request mentioned above, “for the construction of a disinfestation plant using the disinfestation system with hydrogen cyanide” (*zum Bau einer Entwesungsanlage nach dem System der Blausäure-Entwesung*)
- July 10, 1942: The head of Central Construction Office sends on to Construction Inspection of the Waffen-SS and Police Government General the administrative documents concerning “disinfestation unit” (*Entwesungsanlage*).
- July 10, 1942: The “explanatory report for the construction of a disinfestation unit for the Lublin fur and garment workshop” (*Erläuterungsbericht zur Errichtung einer Entwesungsanlage für die Pelz- und Bekleidungswerkstätte Lublin*) is drawn up.
- July 10, 1942: The “cost estimate for the construction of a disinfestation barrack for the Lublin fur and garment workshop” (*Kostenanschlag über Errichtung einer Entwesungsbaracke für die Pelz- und Bekleidungswerkstätte Lublin*) is drawn up.
- August 1942: Drawing for “POW camp Lublin. Disinfestation plant. Building XIIA”(K.G.L. Lublin. *Entwesungsanlage. Bauwerk XIIA*) is executed
- September 11, 1942: Central Construction Office places an order for

two “hot air heaters” (*Heissluftapparate*) with the company Theodor Klein for the “disinfestation plant” (*Entwesungsanlage*).

– October 22, 1942: The list of buildings (*Bauwerke*) finished contains the entry “construction of a disinfestation plant” (*Erstellung einer Entwesungsanlage*) for the Lublin fur and garment workshop (*Pelz- und Bekleidungswerkstätte Lublin*).

Later on, the chamber on the east side (to the right, coming from the *Bad und Desinfektion I* barrack) was divided up by means of a central partition.

No document and no account from a witness prove that this unit was used for a homicidal purpose.

Elsewhere I have shown images and explained the operation of the closures of those doors.[\[560\]](#) The presence of a peephole in the doors does not prove anything, because the doors of the disinfestation cells were equipped with peepholes.

When they speak of an alleged “gas detector” in one of the doors (!),[\[561\]](#) the authors show all their tragic ignorance in matters of disinfestation (and alleged homicidal gas chambers). The door in question (photograph on p. 167) has actually two closure levers on the left, one near the top, one near the bottom, and a handle in the middle, a hole for a thermometer in the center, a peephole (below the hole) and a metal plate at bottom right.[\[562\]](#)

But what about the carbon monoxide unit? Let us underline, first of all, that no official historian has ever explained why the SS in the camp, which had at its disposal two alleged homicidal gas chambers using Zyklon B with air heaters, would have split chamber II in two, using only the first room (of some 17 m²) as a gas chamber with carbon monoxide and equipping chamber I, which worked with Zyklon B, also with a carbon monoxide unit – and all this in a camp which never ran low on Zyklon B. The documentation concerning the supply of Zyklon B is complete; the camp received a total of 6,961 kg of this product.[\[563\]](#)

There is, however, another much more cogent argument: there is no evidence that the pipes in the two rooms mentioned above were used for the introduction of carbon monoxide. Two steel cylinders in an adjoining room are the only “proof” in this respect. A sign in five languages tells us that

“from here, the supply of carbon monoxide to two chambers was regulated.”

But what proof is there that the two cylinders did actually contain carbon monoxide? None. On the two cylinders preserved to this day we actually can

still read the following engraved inscription:[\[564\]](#)

“Dr. Pater Victoria Kohlensäurefabrik Nussdorf Nr 6196 Full. 10 kg [illegible] und Fluid Warszawa Kohlensäure [illegible] Fluid Warszawa Lukowski. Pleschen 10,1 kg CO₂ gepr.”

These two cylinders therefore did not contain carbon monoxide (i.e. CO) but *Kohlensäure* (carbon dioxide, CO₂) which, as most know, is not a toxic gas.

Of course, neither the authors, nor their source, Tregenza, nor any other official historian has ever gone into this minor detail, which is certainly not irrelevant. Instead, quoting each other in an incestuous way, they have continued to wrongly tell the world that the two cylinders contained toxic carbon monoxide!

2.4. Gas Chamber at Mauthausen

The authors then address the gas chambers at Mauthausen. Let us look at the “converging evidence” they have selected.

At the present time, the room measures 3.59 by 3.87 meters or 13.89 m² and is 2.42 m high.[\[565\]](#) It is equipped with

- two metal doors, gas-tight, with peephole
- a water pipe with 16 shower heads
- a water outlet in the floor with metal grid
- a heater consisting of 5 horizontal tubes
- a tiled section some 1.5 m high all around
- a metal plate which closes a round opening in the ceiling.

The authors qualify the room as a “camouflaged shower” (p. 168) and speak of “fake showerheads” (p. 172), which is wrong because the showers are real and were operational. The water on the floor went out by way of a proper sewer. Their assertion is based not on the shower installation in the room but on a simple deduction:

“It makes little sense to argue (as deniers do) that the adjoining gas chamber (figure 32) was either a shower room or a delousing chamber. First, a shower and delousing chamber already existed at the front of the camp (where we would expect to find them); second, why would the Nazis have placed either a delousing room or a shower room next to a dissection room and crematorium?” (p. 172)

Thus, in the strange logic of the authors, because there already was a shower installation near the entrance into the camp, no showers could have

been installed anywhere else! Along the same lines, one could argue that because with buildings BW 5a and 5b there already existed two shower rooms at Birkenau (which are actually nowhere near “the front of the camp”) the 50 showers in the *Zentralsauna* had to be fake!

The same goes, obviously, for the “delousing chamber.” In this case the deductions of the authors make even less sense, because what they call, rightly, a “delousing chamber,” and show in a photograph on p. 169, is really an autoclave which, as its name *Dampf-Desinfektionsapparat* (steam disinfection apparatus) clearly says, worked with *steam* and not with Zyklon B. Therefore the existence of this type of device excludes even less the possibility of a *Zyklon B disinfection unit* elsewhere in the camp. This is yet another example of how the authors apply the “accepted rules of reason”!

The authors then turn their attention to the heater, the tubes of which are similar to those that exist “in an office at Auschwitz” (p. 171f.) and state:

“The pipes in the gas chamber appear to have been installed to heat the room to hasten the rapid evaporation of the hydrocyanic acid from the Zyklon-B pellets.” (p. 172)

The sources they mention in note 85 on p. 277 are the classic work by Hans Maršálek concerning Mauthausen (they give his name as J. Marszalek, confusing him with Józef Marszałek, the Polish author of a book on Majdanek!) plus five more titles on Majdanek – but here we are dealing with the gas chambers at Mauthausen!

Of course, the reference to the book by Maršálek does not give the page number, as usual, just to make it difficult for curious readers who might want to check if what they say is correct. And in fact, what they write is not what is in the source. In it we read:[\[566\]](#)

“In this room [the room next to the gas chamber] there was a table, a gas mask and a gas introduction device connected to the gas chamber by means of a tube. The hot brick was put into the gas introduction device, its function was to speed up the transformation of the crystals [sic] of Zyklon B into liquid gas [in flüssiges Gas].”

In a little book dedicated to the alleged homicidal gassings at Mauthausen, Hans Maršálek has explained in detail how the gas chamber is supposed to have worked: In the room next to it, there was a device for the introduction of the gas (a kind of metal box with a gas-tight lid) hooked up to a tube inside the gas chamber, one meter long with a slot, 80 cm long and ½ cm wide.

The SS would put a brick into the muffle of the nearby crematorium, and

when it was red hot, they placed it on the bottom of the gas introduction device, sprinkled the contents of a can of Zyklon B on it and closed the lid.
[567]

In that way, the hydrogen cyanide allegedly evaporated immediately and the vapors entered the gas chamber through the slotted tube.[568] The gas mixture was removed by means of a ceiling fan in a corner of the room.

Hence, the heater had no function for the alleged homicidal use of the gas chamber – but then why was it there at all? And why were there operational showers?

As I have shown elsewhere,[569] the Mauthausen gas chamber could not have operated in the way described. Actually, it was initially a disinfestation chamber using hydrogen cyanide equipped with a *Degesch* air circulation device suitable for this room and identical to the one in the disinfestation plant (and alleged gas chamber) at Sachsenhausen, which also possessed real showers. Hence, both gas chambers could also be used as showers.

The authors then ask with feigned ingenuousness “why would the Nazis have placed either a delousing room or a shower room next to a dissection room and crematorium” (p. 172). Precisely for the hygiene of the personnel assigned to handling the corpses! Actually, between the alleged gas chamber and the furnace room there was a mortuary with a refrigeration unit and a dissecting room. After all, this personnel handled the corpses of detainees, many of whom had died from contagious diseases, so they would have needed to take showers more quickly and frequently than anyone else. And that also went for the disinfestation of their clothes. Needless to say that the disinfestation unit also served the rest of the camp.

The authors then have the audacity to conclude:

“All the evidence from these various sources points to this macabre conclusion”! (p. 172)

and add:

“It is not enough for deniers to concoct an alternative explanation that amounts to nothing more than denying each piece of freestanding evidence. They must proffer a theory that not only explains all of the evidence but does so in a manner superior to the present theory. This they have not done. Our conclusion stands on this bedrock of scientific history.” (p. 172)

This is exactly what I have done in this chapter, demonstrating on the one hand the total historical inconsistency of the theories proposed by the authors

and re-establishing, on the other hand, the historical truth on the basis of documents.

3. “Convergent Documentary Evidence” of the Holocaust

3.1. The Definition of the “Holocaust”

If we want to express correctly the theses of revisionism, then we must, first of all, give a correct definition of the “Holocaust.” In this respect, the authors write:

“When historians talk about the ‘Holocaust’, what they mean on the most general level is that about six million Jews were killed in an intentional and systematic fashion by the Nazis using a number of different means, including gas chambers. According to this widely accepted definition of the Holocaust, so-called Holocaust revisionists are in effect denying the Holocaust, since they deny its three key components – the killing of six million, gas chambers, and intentionality.” (p. XV)

This definition is acceptable, with the restriction that the essential factors are the gas chambers and the intentionality, that is, the planned and systematic assassination of Jews as such. The numerical aspect is less relevant because – as a principle – the six million do not demonstrate the reality of a planned extermination carried out in gas chambers. As the authors correctly say, but with a different meaning,

“whether it is five or six million is central to the victims, but from the point of view of whether the Holocaust took place it is irrelevant.” (p. 174)

What counts is not the number of victims but whether they were killed according to a governmental plan involving mass extermination in gas chambers. I will come back to this question in chapter 3.4.

3.2. The Liberation of the Camps

However, the authors then go on and act as if they had forgotten their definition and toss into the kettle of the Holocaust anything they can put their hands on.

Thus, on p. 173, after having reported G.M. Gilbert’s description of the “Nazi leaders’ reactions to a film of concentration camps liberated by Americans,” they declare:

“This raw description at the Nuremberg trials of some Nazi leaders’

shock and horror at the scope and scale of the Holocaust gives us some indication of just how far beyond belief the mass murder was even to the perpetrators.”

Hence, the situation prevailing in Germany in the spring of 1945, when the country was in utter chaos, when epidemics ravaged the camps and decimated the inmate population, becomes a “proof” of the Holocaust, a “proof” of an *intentional* “mass extermination.”

The lack of foundation of this argument and the bad faith of those who expound it are all too evident. It is well known that in the western concentration camps the peaks of mortality among the detainees were tragically reached *after* the end of the alleged mass extermination program.

For example, at Buchenwald, of the 32,878 deaths among the detainees registered in the camp hospital, a solid 12,595 occurred in 1945, over a period of three months and a half, as compared to 20,283 in the preceding six years,[\[570\]](#) at Dachau, there were 27,839 deaths with 15,384 in the first five months of 1945 and 12,455 in the five years prior to that,[\[571\]](#) at Mauthausen, out of the 86,024 deaths registered, 36,043 took place between January and May 1945 and 49,981 during the preceding seven years,[\[572\]](#) and at Sachsenhausen, with 19,900 deaths, 4,821 of them occurred in the four months of 1945 and 15,079 during the five earlier years.¹¹⁹

If we follow the official line of thought, then the alleged order given by Himmler putting an end to the extermination of Jews was said to have been issued in October of 1944, as is well-known,[\[574\]](#) so that, in practice, the detainees started dying by the masses after the end of mass exterminations.

3.3. The Einsatzgruppen

Just as unfounded is the thesis of the authors that “the *Einsatzgruppen* prove the Holocaust happened” (p. 182). Actually, the shootings carried out by the *Einsatzgruppen* do not at all prove the existence of an extermination plan, nor are they denied as such by the revisionists.

With respect to the first point, the concomitant policy of the National Socialists with respect to the Jews in the West excludes that the



Alex Grobman[\[573\]](#)

Einsatzgruppen were following a general order to exterminate Jews as such. Christopher R. Browning, writing on the alleged order to exterminate all Russian Jews, has this to say concerning the matter:[575]

“However, Nazi policy towards the Jews was not immediately changed by it. One went on to talk about emigration, expulsion and plans for a future resettlement.”

Emigration of Western Jews was actually prohibited only on October 23, 1941,[576] and, as we shall see later, the Wannsee conference was convened for December 9, 1941,[577] precisely to inform the competent authorities of this fact and of its implications.

Let us move on to the second point. What revisionism objects to is

- a) that the *Einsatzgruppen* had the order to exterminate the Jews because they were Jews, and
- b) the number of those shot.

In a study of Treblinka, which I wrote together with Jürgen Graf, I have brought forward valid arguments in support of these two arguments.[578] For example, the “*Braune Mappe*” (June 1941) is explicit that *Sowjetjuden* (bolshevist Jews) were to be shot, but not the rest of the Jewish population, which was to be moved to ghettos. And the section “Directive for the treatment of the Jewish question” in this document opens with the following lines:[579]

“All measures concerning the Jewish question in the eastern territories will be handled on the basis that the Jewish question in general will be solved after the war for Europe as a whole.”

In the study mentioned above I have moreover expounded a number of points proving the unacceptability of the figures quoted in the *Einsatzgruppen* reports. For example, in the summary of the activity of *Einsatzgruppe A* (October 16, 1941, to January 31, 1942) the number of Jews present in Latvia at the arrival of the German troops is 70,000, but the number of Jews shot is reported as being 71,184! Furthermore, another 3,750 Jews were alive in work camps. In Lithuania, there were 153,743 Jews, of which 136,421 were allegedly shot, whereas 34,500 were taken to the ghettos at Kaunas, Wilna, and Schaulen, but the total of those two figures is 170,921 Jews!

The 34,500 Jews in the ghettos – according to this report – were persons fit for work (all others having been shot), but according to the census carried out in May of 1942, there were 14,545 Jews in the Wilna ghetto; their names

(complete with date of birth, profession, and address) have been published by the Jewish Museum at Vilnius. This source shows that out of the 14,545 Jews listed, some 3,693 (25.4% of the total) were children. Had they come back to life?

The activity and situation report no. 6 of the *Einsatzgruppen* for the period of October 1-31, 1941, mentions the shooting of 33,771 Jews at Kiev (Babi Yar) on September 29 and 30, but such a massacre never took place, and the story of its gigantic pyres is completely false. The only “proof” that the Soviets found on the site was a pair of worn-out shoes and some rags, which they diligently took pictures of, and in their Babi Yar album they claimed about them:[\[580\]](#)

“Remains of shoes and clothing of the Soviet citizens shot by the Germans at Babi Yar”!

Let us not say anything about the ghost-like “Action 1005,” which the authors talk about on p. 107, that is to say, the alleged unearthing and burning of the corpses from the mass graves under the direction of Paul Blobel. In spite of the enormous activity (to put it mildly) – 2,100,000 corpses unearthed from thousands of mass graves and burned in hundreds of places spread out across a territory of more than 1,200,000 square kilometers over thirteen months – there is neither documentary nor material evidence!

3.4. The Six Million

In the section “How many Jews died and how we know” (p. 174), the authors bring forward the hollow and deceptive argument of the six million:

“To challenge the deniers we can begin with a simple question: If six million Jews did not die, where did they all go?” (pp. 174f.)

But whether or not six million Jews did in fact disappear, this is exactly what the fuss is all about.

With this in mind the authors mainly rely on the affidavit of Wilhelm Höttl of November 26, 1945, about which we have already spoken and in which Höttl stated that Eichmann had told him that the number of Jews killed “must have been greater than six million” (p. 175).

However, an assertion based on mere hearsay has no value among historians, and the authors know this. They therefore invoke the “confirmation” by German political scientist Wolfgang Benz, editor of a statistical study,[\[581\]](#) even managing to make a mistake as far as the publisher is concerned (note 6 on p. 277).

Needless to say, the authors fail to mention the best revisionist study in the field of statistics, Walter N. Sanning's work, even though it first appeared in the United States![\[582\]](#)

In a comparison of the working methods used in the study edited by W. Benz and in Sanning's book, Germar Rudolf[\[583\]](#) has shown that out of the 6,277,441 Jewish victims that Benz arrives at, 533,193 are totally invented[\[584\]](#) inasmuch as they result from a double count, whereas for Sanning only 1,113,153¹³⁴ Jews have apparently disappeared. No less important is the fact that out of Benz' total of 6,277,441 victims, fewer than three million concern the alleged extermination camps – i.e. the Holocaust in the strict sense of the term – and Benz can attribute to the massacres of the *Einsatzgruppen* only part of the ca. 3.3 million remaining dead.[\[585\]](#)

Raul Hilberg, the most authoritative official historian, arrives at 5,100,000 Jewish victims, of whom only 2,700,000 are attributed to the alleged extermination camps.[\[586\]](#) In their own table on p. 128, the authors assign 3,062,000 victims to the “extermination camps,” but neglect that – according to Franciszek Piper – the presently accepted figure for Auschwitz, 1,100,000 victims, actually contains some 100,000 non-Jews,[\[587\]](#) so that their effective total should be 2,962,000.

How reliable the official statistics and the historians who prepared them really are can be deduced from a statement by the authors:

“For example, they [the “deniers”] often cite the fact that Franciszek Piper, the head of the Department of Holocaust Studies at the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum, has refined the number killed at Auschwitz from four million to a little more than one million, arguing that this proves their case. But they fail to note that at the same time the numbers have been revised up – for example, the number of Jews murdered by the Einsatzgruppen during and after the invasion of the Soviet Union. The net result of the number of Jews killed – approximately six million – has not changed.” (p. XVI)

Let us look at the problem in terms of figures. Because four million out of the total of six were originally attributed to Auschwitz[\[588\]](#) and because those four million have later been reduced to one million, the remaining three million killed must be attributed to the *Einsatzgruppen* and so the total of six million “has not changed.” That is a stupid lie.

In the book of W. Benz mentioned above there is a comparison of statistical data compiled by Wellers, by Reitlinger, by Hilberg, and from the

Holocaust Encyclopedia.

For the Soviet Union (activity of the *Einsatzgruppen*) the book gives a minimum figure of 750,000 (G. Reitlinger) and a maximum number of 2,100,000 (Benz).[\[589\]](#)

It is, hence, true that starting in 1953, the number of victims attributed to the *Einsatzgruppen* has been “revised up,” but only by 1,350,000 victims. So the question arises as to where the remainder of the invented victims at Auschwitz ($3,000,000 - 1,350,000 = 1,650,000$) should be moved. These 1,650,000 false victims ought to have been deducted from the total of six million, but by a stroke of cabbalist magic, the total “has not changed.”

No less surprising is the fact that, from the same sources concerning the Soviet Union, some scholars such as Benz derive a total of 2,100,000 deaths, whereas others arrive at less than half that figure. Raul Hilberg, in fact, writes:[\[590\]](#)

“The adjusted deficit is therefore still 850,000 – 900,000, and from this number one must deduct at least five categories of victims that are not attributable to the Holocaust: (1) Jewish Red Army soldiers killed in battle, (2) Jewish prisoners of war who died in captivity unrecognized as Jews, (3) Jewish dead in Soviet corrective labor camps during 1939-1959, (4) civilian Jewish dead in the battle zone, particularly in the besieged cities of Leningrad and Odessa, and (5) deaths caused by privation among Jews who had fled or who had been evacuated for reasons other than fear of German anti-Jewish acts.”

Hilberg assumes that between 100,000 and 200,000 Jews fall into those five categories, which means that the number of victims of the Holocaust for the Soviet Union would be somewhere between 650,000 and 800,000, i.e. between 1,300,000 and 1,450,000 less than Benz’ figure.

The causes of death considered by Hilberg, together with yet others (such as Jews who died as partisans, or an increase in natural mortality), also apply to western Jews, and in particular to those from Poland. The Korherr report states that for Germany, Austria, and Bohemia-Moravia alone, the Jewish population diminished by 82,776 on account of an increase in the mortality up to December 31, 1942.[\[591\]](#) What about the rest of Europe and the period up to 1945? One final observation as to the reliability of the official statistics: How was the category of Jewish survivors arrived at after the Second World War?

In France, a survivor was defined as a person who registered with the

Ministry for Veterans before the end of 1945.[\[592\]](#) In Poland, the list of survivors was established on June 15, 1945,[\[593\]](#) and it is clear that in order to be registered, those persons also had to sign in with some official agency. A similar practice applied throughout the whole of Europe.

But how many survivors preferred not to go back to their native country? And how many preferred not to declare that they were alive and Jewish at all? And how can we be sure that the first statistics and later census data were not manipulated?

The figures are, therefore, not as easy to arrive at as the authors would have us believe. And as they themselves admit, figures are irrelevant to the question of whether or not the Holocaust ever took place.

Therefore, let us move on to other “converging proofs.”

3.5. The Wannsee Protocol

The authors cite the so-called Wannsee Protocol as “further evidence that Hitler ordered the Final Solution” (p. 216). In their self-proclaimed demonstration for this topic the authors employ the whole arsenal of those pseudo-historical tricks, for which they have always blamed the revisionist historians.

They summarize, first of all, the four parts, into which the document[\[594\]](#) is divided. The first section lists the officials who participated in the meeting. The second part is a run-down of the activities to date in the area of “the final solution of the Jewish question in Europe.” For this part, the authors furnish a most tendentious summary, putting the stress on “forcing Jews out” of the German living space, but in a mafia-like kind of omission they say nothing about the type and scope of such actions. I quote from the protocol:[\[595\]](#)

“In pursuance of these endeavors, an accelerated emigration of the Jews from the territory of the Reich was seen as the only temporary solution and was accordingly embarked upon in an intensified and systematic manner.

On instruction of the Reich Marshal [i.e. Göring], a Reich Central Office for Jewish Emigration was established in January 1939; its direction was entrusted to the Head of the Security Police and the Security Service (SD). Its particular tasks were:

a) to take measures for the preparation of increased Jewish emigration,

b) to direct the flow of emigration,

c) to speed up the emigration process in individual cases.

The aim of this task was to purge German living space of Jews by legal means.”

The document goes on to say that as a consequence of this policy, in spite of difficulties, roughly 537,000 Jews were compelled to emigrate between January 30, 1933, and October 31, 1941. Of these,

- ca. 360,000 left the *Altreich* (Germany with its 1937 borders) after January 30, 1933.
- ca. 147,000 left the *Ostmark* (Austria) after March 15, 1938,
- ca. 30,000 left the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia (Czechia) after March 15, 1939.[\[596\]](#)

As these data are in total contradiction with Hitler’s alleged homicidal intentions towards the Jews and with the preconceived theses of the authors, they simply keep quiet about them!

What the authors write with respect to the third part of the document is a real masterwork of scientific disfiguration:

“In part III we glimpse a smoking gun. Eichmann announces that a new plan has been devised: ‘Another possible solution of the problem has now taken the place of emigration, i.e., the evacuation of the Jews to the East.’ Evacuation is a not-so-veiled code for sending them to their death in the eastern camps. Why make this assumption? Eichmann had just described the first two attempts at solving the Jewish question, both of which he said were inadequate, followed by ‘another solution.’” (p. 219f.)

For the authors, the new solution is imbedded in the well-known passage of the document, which speaks of the deportation of Jews to the east and which end in the following way:

“The remnant that eventually remains will require suitable treatment; because it will without doubt represent the most resistant part, it consists of a natural selection that could, on its release, become the germ-cell of a new Jewish revival. (Witness the experience of history).” (p. 220)

The authors comment:

“The ‘evacuation of the Jews’ Eichmann describes cannot mean simple deportation to live elsewhere, since the Nazis had already been deporting Jews to the east, and Eichmann indicates this was inadequate. Instead, he outlines a new solution. Shipment to the east will mean, for those who can work, work until death, and (as we know from other sources) for those who cannot work, immediate death. What about those who can work and

do not succumb to death? ‘The remnant that eventually remains will require suitable treatment’. Suitable treatment can only mean murder.” (pp. 220f.)

The entire argument is built upon a vulgar trick of interpretation. With reference to the tasks of the central agencies of the Reich in charge of Jewish emigration, the document says:¹⁴⁶

“The aim of this task was to purge German living space of Jews by legal means. The disadvantages of such expediting emigration methods were evident to all agencies concerned.”

The document, therefore, does not speak of “the first two attempts at solving the Jewish question” – it refers only to emigration into other countries – nor does it call both attempts “inadequate,” but says merely that emigrations presented “disadvantages” and that various factors, especially financial ones, rendered emigration difficult.¹⁴⁶

Then, in a flagrant distortion, the authors declare that “the Nazis had already been deporting Jews to the east, and Eichmann indicates this was inadequate,” thereby transforming the emigration to other countries into “the evacuation of the Jews to the east” and grafting on to this alleged deportation the false description of being “inadequate”!

The “assumption” that “evacuation is a not-so-veiled code” is an arbitrary and unfounded assertion refuted by the documents, starting with the memo[597] written by the head of the Germany department in the German Foreign Office, dated August 21, 1942, which the authors obviously do not even mention, and by numerous Jewish transports from the Old Reich, Austria, the Protectorate, and Slovakia, which went to Lublin from March 1942 onwards.[598]

The claim that “evacuation” stood for sending the Jews to their death “in the eastern camps” (i.e. Belzec, Sobibor, and Treblinka) is moreover absurd, because at the moment of the conference none of those camps existed yet.

What should one think of the expression “suitable treatment”? In this case, too, the authors can only claim that this stands for assassination by deforming the sense of the text: If those who are left over after “natural reduction” were to be released, “they would turn into a germ cell of renewed Jewish revival” – thus, they must not be released.

The interpretation by the authors rests instead on the assumption that the expression “in case of release” should be read as “in case they are allowed to live,” and this is precisely where they try to lead the reader by the nose.

Finally, let us look at a few other serious points the authors have astutely left out in their effort to obscure the meaning of the document and to distort it at will.

I have already drawn the readers' attention to the policy of Jewish emigration and to the 537,000 Jews who *did* emigrate from the territories under German jurisdiction between 1933 and October 1939. I will now discuss three more such aspects.

The aim of the meeting was to inform the authorities involved about the end of the emigration policy directed towards third countries and about the beginning of deportations to the east:[599]

"In the meantime, the Reichsführer-SS and Head of the German Police [i.e. Himmler] has forbidden any further emigration of Jews in view of the dangers posed by emigration in wartime and the looming possibilities in the East. As a further possible solution, and with the appropriate prior authorization by the Führer, emigration has now been replaced by evacuation to the East. This operation should be regarded only as a provisional option, though in view of the coming final solution of the Jewish question it is already supplying practical experience of vital importance"

Upon the Führer's orders, then, Jewish emigration was supplanted by their evacuation to the occupied eastern territories but *only as a provisional option*, and it is clear that a physical extermination cannot reasonably be interpreted as a provisional option. That is why the authors have conveniently chosen not to mention this passage.

Let us move on to their second omission:[600]

"The evacuated Jews will first be taken, group after group, to so-called transit ghettos from where they will be transported further to the East."

If the deportation of the Jews stood for their liquidation "in the eastern camps," then what where the transit ghettos? Another "codeword"? I will come back to this question at the end of this section.

The third omission concerns a passage, which flies right in the face of the "assumption" the authors have made. If this assumption were true, the first victims of the "evacuations" would have been those unfit for work, in particular the aged. But this is what the document actually says in this respect:[601]

"The intention is not to evacuate Jews over the age of 65 but to send them to an old people's ghetto; Theresienstadt has been earmarked for

this purpose.”

Thus we have here an excellent example of the trickery and the deliberate omissions practiced by the authors and aimed at distorting the meaning of a document and deceive their readers!

Before we conclude, let us address those transit ghettos. On pp. 204f., the authors produce the English translation of a letter written by Himmler to *Gauleiter* Arthur Greiser of September 18, 1941. The document states explicitly that in order to follow Hitler’s wishes, Himmler was implementing the deportation of the Jews from the old Reich and the Protectorate into those eastern areas (*Ostgebiete*), which had been occupied by the Germans two years earlier, as a first step (*als erste Stufe*) and, if possible, during 1941. In the following spring they were to be moved still further east (*noch weiter nach Osten abzuschieben*).

Himmler intended to deport 60,000 Jews from the old Reich and the Protectorate to the Lodz ghetto “for the winter” (*für den Winter*) while waiting, precisely, to deport them even further to the east in the spring of the following year (p. 264),[\[602\]](#) because Lodz was to be used as a transit ghetto. This demonstrates that the transit ghettos of the Wannsee protocol were, purely and simply, transit ghettos.

Thus we have here a document – one of many – describing unmistakably the deportation of Jews to the east as a true deportation without any homicidal intentions (in September of 1941 the alleged extermination camps in the east did not yet exist). But for the authors this becomes an allegedly converging “proof” of Hitler’s decision to go ahead with the mass extermination of the European Jews. And this in spite of the fact that the authors are absolutely aware of the absurd nature of their conjecture:

“Witte [\[603\]](#) concludes: ‘*This terminology already represents the virtual death sentence for those Jews due for deportation, irrespective of the fact that at this point there were no extermination camps ready.*’ (p. 205)

Such a conclusion is an insult to the science of history and to the “accepted rules of reason.”

3.6. “Ausrottung” and “Vernichtung”

As “convergent proofs” of the reality of the Holocaust the authors go on to produce the usual array of quotations from major NS officials, in which the evidence is said to be the use of terms like “vernichten” or “Vernichtung”

(annihilate or annihilation) and “*ausrotten*” or “*Ausrottung*” (exterminate or extermination).

The authors devote a particular section (“The *Ausrotten* of the Jews,” p. 205) to an attempt at proving that these terms, which were part of the violent NS rhetoric, did in fact mean physical extermination.

As is well known, the official historiography’s traditional starting point of such fallacious interpretations is an extrapolation of Hitler’s so-called “prophecy” in his speech of January 30, 1939:[\[604\]](#)

“I shall again make myself a prophet today: If the international Jewish financiers, inside or outside of Europe, were to be able to push the peoples once more into a world war, the result will not be the bolshevization of the Earth and, hence, the victory of Judaism, but the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe.”

No one among those brave extrapolators ever quotes the lines that follow and that clearly explain the terms of this threat:¹⁵⁴

“[...] for the time in which the non-Jewish peoples were defenseless in the face of propaganda is coming to an end. National Socialist Germany and fascist Italy possess the institutions which will allow, if necessary, to explain to the world the essence of a question, of which many people are instinctively aware, but which is still unclear to them in scientific terms.”

Thus, the “annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe” consisted simply in showing the other peoples those German and fascist institutions, which spread the “scientific knowledge” about the “Jewish question.”

In his speech of January 30, 1941, Hitler said:[\[605\]](#)

“I will not forget the indication I have given once before to the German Reichstag, on 1st September 1939 [actually on January 30, 1939]. The indication that if the rest of the world were to be precipitated by Judaism into a general war, entire Judaism will have finished the role they have been playing in Europe.”

Thus, if the Jews were no longer able to play their role in Europe, the “*Vernichtung*” announced in 1939 was nothing but a political “annihilation.”

This interpretation is confirmed by Hitler’s words used in his speech at the Berlin Sportpalast of January 30, 1942:[\[606\]](#)

“We realize that this war can only end like this: either the Aryan peoples will be exterminated (ausgerottet werden) or Judaism will vanish from Europe (das Judentum aus Europa verschwindet). On September 1, 1939 [actually, on 30 January 1939], I have told the German Reichstag

once before – and I shy away from risky prophecies – that this war will not end the way the Jews think, that is with the Aryan peoples of Europe being exterminated (ausgerottet werden), but that the result of this war will be the annihilation of Judaism (die Vernichtung des Judentums). [...] And the day will come when the worst enemy of mankind will have finished his role, perhaps at least for a thousand years.”

Does this mean that Hitler literally believed the “Aryan peoples” would be *physically annihilated* in case the war was lost?

This quotation confirms, moreover, that the “*Vernichtung*” of the Jewish race in Europe in the speech of January 30, 1939, was not physical extermination, because here the text speaks of a Judaism that vanishes “from Europe” in case of victory. This, together with the end of the political role of the Jews in Europe, can only be explained by the plans to deport the Jews into the occupied eastern territories, which were considered to be extra-European.

On February 24, 1942, Hitler comes back to this argument. After having asserted that the “plot” (*Verschwörung*) of the plutocrats and the Kremlin was aimed at one and the same objective – “the extermination (*die Ausrottung*) of the Aryan peoples and races,” Hitler says:[\[607\]](#)

“Today, the ideas of our National Socialist revolution and those of fascism have conquered large and powerful states, and my prophecy will be fulfilled that this war will not bring about the annihilation of Aryan mankind – it is the Jew who will be exterminated.”

In his notes, Henry Picker writes for July 21, 1942:[\[608\]](#)

“[...] because – Hitler envisioning to have thrown the Jews out of Europe down to the last man at the end of the present war – the communist danger from the east would then have been exterminated with root and branch.”

This figurative meaning of the verb “*ausrotten*” and of the associated noun appears also in the speech of September 30, 1942, in which Hitler said:[\[609\]](#)

“On September 1, 1939 [actually, on January 30, 1939], I said two things during the session of the Reichstag. First of all [...] and, secondly, if Judaism were to provoke an international world war for the extermination (zur Ausrottung) of the Aryan peoples of Europe, not these Aryan peoples of Europe would be exterminated (ausgerottet werden) but Judaism.”

In his speech on November 8, 1942, Hitler paraphrased his “prophecy” of January 30, 1939, in the following manner:[\[610\]](#)

“You will remember the Reichstag session in which I declared: If Judaism has the illusion of being able to provoke an international world war with the aim of the extermination (zur Ausrottung) of the European races, the result will be not the extermination (die Ausrottung) of the European races, but the extermination (die Ausrottung) of Judaism in Europe!”

Hitler went on again to explain the meaning of this “Ausrottung”: the awareness of the Jewish peril by the European peoples and the introduction, in those nations, of an anti-Jewish legislation modeled on the German one:¹⁶⁰

“In Europe, this danger has been recognized and the nations are adhering one by one to our legislation.”

Finally, in his speech of February 24, 1943, Hitler declared:[\[611\]](#)

“This fight, therefore, will not end – as it is intended – with the annihilation (mit der Vernichtung) of the Aryan [part of] mankind but with the extermination (mit der Ausrottung) of Judaism in Europe.”

Here we even have the perfect equivalence of the terms “Vernichtung” and “Ausrottung” with both being applied to the European peoples.

To summarize: Either Hitler believed in a physical extermination not only of the German but of all European peoples (!) in the event of a German defeat – a decidedly grotesque assumption – or else he was using the terms “Vernichtung” and “Ausrottung” in the figurative sense *also* when applied to Jewry, which is patently obvious when we look at the various quotations and their context.

And that this is indeed the correct interpretation – if we still need a further confirmation – is stated explicitly by a historian above suspicion, Joseph Billig, former researcher at the Paris Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation:[\[612\]](#)

“The term ‘Vernichtung’ (annihilation, destruction) referred to the absolutely negative attitude towards a Jewish presence in the Reich. Being absolute, this attitude embraced the readiness, if necessary, to go to extreme ends. The term in question did not mean that one had already reached the stage of an extermination nor did it signify that there was a deliberate intention to arrive there.

A few days before the speech quoted [the speech of January 30, 1939], Hitler received the Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia. He reproached

his quest for the lack of energy on the part of the Prague government in its efforts to reach an understanding with the Reich and recommended to him, in particular, energetic measures against the Jews.

In this regard, he declared for example: ‘Over here, they are being annihilated’ (*bei uns werden sie vernichtet*). Are we to believe that, during a diplomatic conversation, which would be recorded in the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Hitler would have confidentially alluded to a massacre in the Third Reich – which, moreover, would have been incorrect for that moment in time?

Two years later, on January 30, 1941, Hitler returned to his ‘prophecy’ of 1939. But this time, he explained the meaning as follows: ‘... and I do not wish to forget the indication I have given once before in the Reichstag, namely that if the rest of the world (*die andere Welt*) is driven into a war, Judaism will have completely ended its role in Europe...’

In his conversation with the Czechoslovak minister, Hitler mentioned England and the United States which, in his opinion, would be in a position to offer regions suitable for Jewish settlers.

In January of 1941 he stated that the role of the Jews in Europe would come to an end and added that this would come about because the other European peoples would understand this need for their own countries. At that time, one believed in the creation of a Jewish reserve. But for Hitler such a reserve was acceptable only outside of Europe. [Thus] we have just noted that, on January 30, 1941, Hitler did nothing but announce the liquidation of the role of the Jews in Europe.”

3.7. Extrapolated Quotations

Having set up a historical and contextual frame, let us now move on to quotations that the authors have extrapolated.

3.7.1. Hans Frank

“Hans Frank proves the Holocaust happened” (p. 186)

The authors quote a speech by H. Frank given on October 7, 1940, in which the following sentence appears:

“I could not eliminate (ausrotten) all lice and Jews in only one year.”
(p. 186)

Actually, the speech was given on December 20, 1940, the term

“ausrotten” has been invented by the authors (the German text has “hinaustreiben” = to drive out), and the reference of the document (I have already mentioned this) is wrong (it is PS-2233 and not PS-3363).[\[613\]](#) Hence, we have one falsification and two errors in one swoop!

The speech, to which the authors assign the date of December 13, 1941, was actually given on December 16. This speech also contained the passage quoted by them later, and for which they publish the German text (note 30 on p. 278):[\[614\]](#)

“Currently there are in the Government General [occupied Poland] approximately 2 ½ million, and together with those who are kith and kin and connected in all kinds of ways, we now have 3 ½ million Jews. We cannot shoot these 3 ½ million Jews, nor can we poison them, yet we will have to take measures which will somehow lead to the goal of annihilation, and that will be done in connection with the great measures which are to be discussed together with the Reich.”[\[615\]](#)¹ *The territory of the General Government must be made free of Jews, as is the case in the Reich. Where and how this will happen is a matter of the means which must be used and created, and about whose effectiveness I will inform you in due time.”* (pp. 186f.)

The authors comment:

“If the Final Solution meant only deportation out of the Reich, why does Frank refer to attaining ‘the goal of annihilation’ of Jews through means other than shooting or poisoning? The phrase ‘die irgendwie zu einem Vernichtungserfolg führen’ underlines the murderous intent.” (p. 187)

Even if this interpretation were correct – which it is not – the passage demonstrates only “homicidal intentions,” whereas the authors invoke it as proof of the fact that the Holocaust *happened*! This means that from alleged intentions they deduce the reality of a *fact*!

But this interpretation is unfounded. The quotation actually fits in with the policy of deportations of Jews followed by the National Socialist regime. It must be considered in the light of other statements, which the authors obviously prefer to keep silent about, in order to reveal its real significance.

In Frank’s *Dienst-Tagebuch* (official diary) we have on July 17, 1941, the following entry:[\[616\]](#)

“The Governor General no longer wishes any further creation of ghettos, because, in keeping with an explicit statement by the Führer on

19 June [1941], the Jews will in a not too distant future be moved out of the Government General, and the Government General is to be nothing but a transit camp, so to speak.”

On October 13, 1941, H. Frank and *Reichsminister* Rosenberg had a meeting, in which they touched upon the deportation of Jews from the Government General:[\[617\]](#)

“The Governor General then spoke of the possibility of the expulsion of the Jewish population from the Government General into the occupied territories. Reichsminister Rosenberg remarked that such aspects had already been brought to his attention by the Paris military administration.
[\[618\]](#)

At the moment, though, he did not see any possibility for the implementation of such transfer plans. However, for the future, he was ready to favor Jewish emigration to the east, all the more so as it was already intended to send to those sparsely settled eastern territories especially the asocial elements existing within the territory of the Reich.”

On the other hand, if we follow the passage quoted by the authors, the Government General was to become “free of Jews” (*judenfrei*) “as is the case in the Reich” (*wie es das Reich ist*), but the greater Reich – as we have seen – had only become “*judenfrei*” (to some extent) through the emigration (*Auswanderung*) of some 537,000 Jews to other countries. It is therefore clear that Hans Frank did nothing but emulate Hitler’s “annihilation” rhetoric with the same meaning.

3.7.2. Joseph Goebbels

“Joseph Goebbels proves the Holocaust happened” (p. 187)

The authors come up with two quotations, by which they intend to demonstrate that “the Holocaust happened” on the meager basis of the use of the term “*Vernichtung*.”

The first quotation is taken from a note dated August 19, 1941, in which Goebbels, referring to Hitler’s “prophecy” of January 30, 1939, says that “should Jewry succeed in again provoking a new war, this would end with their annihilation (*Vernichtung*)” (p. 187).[\[619\]](#)

We have already seen that the authors’ interpretation is groundless, being based, as it is, on some sort of superstition associated with that word, independent of context. The most significant example of this kind of treatment is presented by them on p. 214, where they deal with Albert Speer,

who had written a three page statement on Richard Harwood's brochure *Did Six Million Really Die?*.^[620] For the English translation, he added a *written explanation* that he actually meant "looking away" when using the word "*Billigung*" (approval), rather than any "knowledge of an order or its execution." But Shermer and Grobman claim to know better what Speer intended to say, because they write:

"Yet, according to our German-English dictionary, Billigung actually means approval [...]"

This surely is a case of "Dictionary *über alles*"! Obviously, this superstitious, blind believe in dictionaries merely serves to distract from the actual meaning of these extrapolated quotations and, of course, the authors glossing over any proofs opposing their interpretation in order to bolster their deception.

Let us return to Goebbels, though. On August 20, 1941, after a visit to Hitler's HQ, Goebbels noted in his diary:^[621]

"Moreover, the Führer has promised me that he can expel the Berlin Jews to the east as soon as the war in the east is over."

And on September 24, 1941, Goebbels had a talk with Heydrich at Hitler's HQ. The next day he wrote in his diary: the Jews in the east^[622]

"are all to be moved, finally, into the camps built by the Bolsheviks."

These considerations also apply to a note by Goebbels – which the authors assign to February 24, 1942, but which is actually dated February 14 – purportedly saying that the Jews "shall experience their own annihilation together with the destruction of our enemies" (p. 187).

Here the authors use a sleight of hand in the translation. The original text says: "*Sie werden mit der Vernichtung unserer Feinde auch ihre eigene Vernichtung erleben,*"^[623] i.e. "together with the annihilation of our enemies they shall experience their own annihilation." It is clear that the "annihilation of our enemies" did not necessarily imply the total physical extermination of the enemies. The authors have understood this full well, so much so, in fact, that they have translated the term "*Vernichtung*" by "annihilation," when applied to the Jews, but by "destruction" when applied to the enemies.

The reference to Goebbels speech of September 23, 1942, is another proof of the authors' use of dubious and unverified sources, quite at variance with their methodic rules on the acceptability and the verification of sources. Actually, the speech in question had been

“transcribed and passed along by the Polish resistance to the British Foreign Office in May 1943.” (p. 188)

David Irving has identified “the actual Polish origins of it, and the people who have provided it, the Polish Intelligence Service” (p. 189) but still, according to the authors, “that does not invalidate the gist of the speech”! (p. 189).

Because the expression “physical extermination” appears in that speech, the authors – for their personal and political reasons – have decided to close their eyes to criticism and rational thought:

- there is no proof that the speech was ever given,
- there is no proof that, if the speech was indeed given, Goebbels used that expression,
- there is no certainty that, if the speech was given and Goebbels did speak of the Jews, the English rendition of the Polish translation of the words attributed to Goebbels actually corresponds to what he said.

But still, for the authors, “that does not invalidate the gist of the speech”!

As I have demonstrated above, they themselves have falsified a quotation of Hans Frank by substituting the term “*ausrotten*” (annihilate) for “*hinaustreiben*” (drive out), but obviously such an underhanded act “does not invalidate the gist of the speech.”

We then have the well-known quotation from Goebbels’ notes of March 27, 1942:

“Beginning with Lublin the Jews are now being deported eastward from the Government-General. The procedure is pretty barbaric, and one that beggars description, and there’s not much left of the Jews. Broadly speaking one can probably say that sixty percent of them will have to be liquidated, while only forty percent can be put to work.” (p. 190)

The authors comment:

“On March 7, 1942, Goebbels noted in his diary that there were still eleven million Jews in Europe. If, as he notes twenty days later, sixty percent of these ‘will have to be liquidated,’ we have a close approximation of the six million figure, from just about as high a leader in the Nazi regime as can be found.” (p. 190)

To start at the beginning: It is true that in his note of March 7, Goebbels referred to eleven million Jews, but the authors are careful not to say in what context. Actually, the note says:[\[624\]](#)

“The Jewish question will now have to be solved within the framework

of all of Europe. In Europe, there are still 11 million Jews. They must, first of all, be concentrated in the east. At a given time, after the war, an island will have to be assigned to them, maybe Madagascar. Anyway, there will not be peace in Europe as long as the Jews are not completely excluded (ausgeschaltet) from the European territory [...]"

We notice immediately that the concentration of the eleven million Jews in the east did not, in fact, imply their extermination, given that after the war they were to be assigned an island.

Secondly, the figure of eleven million has been taken from the table of statistics that appears on p. 6 of the Wannsee Protocol. Hence, Goebbels was quite aware of the onset of the new policy of deporting the Jews to the east, which Heydrich had announced during that meeting.

With this said, let us take a closer look at the note of March 27, 1942. It refers, no doubt, to this policy of deportations to the east, but Goebbels' statement about the 60% liquidation rate not only has no documentary parallel, it is actually refuted by the facts, as we will see further below.

Secondly, the deportations of Polish Jews to the eastern limits of the Lublin district had already started in early January 1942.[\[625\]](#) One of the first reports dates from January 6, 1942, and refers to the "transfer (Aussiedlung) of 2,000 Jews from Mielec." The text says:[\[626\]](#)

"1,000 Jews arrive in the region of Hrubieszow, final destination (Zielstation Hrubieszow). 1,000 Jews arrive in the region of Cholm, of whom 400 have final destination Wlodawa, 600 final destination Parczew. Ready for reception by January 15, 1942."

A later report on this transfer informs the local authorities:[\[627\]](#)

"I ask you to make absolutely sure that the Jews [arriving] at the final destination are received and properly directed as established by you, and that we will not again have the problems encountered in other cases where the Jews arrive at the final destination without supervision and then scatter throughout the territory."

The directives of the governmental office in charge of transfers, sent to the local authorities as an attachment from the district administrative supervisor Weihrauch, specify:[\[628\]](#)

"The Office of the District of Lublin, Department of Internal Administration and Department for Population and Welfare, is responsible to me with respect to the Jews being transferred receiving, to the extent possible, proper housing."

The Jews to be transferred are to be allowed to carry bed sheets and blankets. They can, furthermore, carry 25 kg of other luggage and household goods. After arrival in their new settlement areas they must undergo medical observation for three weeks. Any case of disease suspected of being typhus must be immediately reported to the competent district medical officer.”

On March 22, a transfer of Jews was carried out from Bilgoraj to Tarnograd, a village some 20 km to the south of this town. The corresponding report states:[\[629\]](#)

“An evacuation of 57 Jewish families with a total of 221 persons implemented from Bilgoraj to Tarnograd. Each family was assigned a vehicle for the transport of movable goods and beds. Control and supervision were assured by the Polish police and by the special service command. Action proceeded as planned without incidents. Those evacuated were housed at Tarnograd the same day.”

And that is taken to be as a “pretty barbaric” procedure?

As far as the split-up of the evacuees into 40% fit for work and 60% “to be liquidated” (*“liquidiert werden müssen”*) is concerned, this is at variance both with the theses of the official historiography in respect to the “eastern extermination camps,” in which a total extermination of Jews – including those fit for work[\[630\]](#) – is said to have been carried out, and with the German projects for Belzec of March 1942.

On March 17, 1942, Fritz Reuters, an employee of *Abteilung Bevölkerungswesen und Fürsorge* (Department for Population and Welfare) with the governor of the district of Lublin, wrote a memo, in which he described a meeting he had had the day before with *SS-Hauptsturmführer* Höfle, who was in charge of the transfer of Jews for the district of Lublin. On the subject of Belzec, the document says:[\[631\]](#)

“Finally, he declared that he could receive 4 – 5 daily transports of 1,000 Jews with final destination Belzec. These Jews will be moved beyond the border and will not return to the Government General.”

This document shows:

1. The Jews were to be split into those fit for work and those unfit.
2. Those fit were to be used for work.
3. Belzec was to be a sorting camp for the Jews fit for work “with a file denoting their professions.” This project is obviously irreconcilable with the thesis that it was a camp for *total* extermination.

4. The Jews unfit for work would all be sent to Belzec. The camp is said to have been able to “receive 4 – 5 daily transports of 1,000 Jews,” obviously unfit for work who would be sent on “beyond the border” and would not return to the Government General. Because of this, Belzec was named “final border station for the Zamosc region.” This makes sense only in the context of a cross-border transfer.[\[632\]](#)

Therefore, the “liquidation” of 60% of the Jews evacuated stood for their removal into the eastern territories. In the Goebbels note, “liquidation” thus has the same meaning as Hitler’s “*Vernichtung*” and “*Ausrottung*.”

3.7.3. Heinrich Himmler

“Heinrich Himmler proves the Holocaust happened.” (p. 190)

This alleged “demonstration” consists of three quotations. The first one dates from January 1937. Himmler spoke of “Roman emperors who exterminated [*ausrotteten*] the first Christians.” From this, the authors conclude that “*ausrotten* meant murder” (p. 191) and therefore, whenever Himmler spoke of “*Ausrottung*” it should be taken to mean assassination. We have here another fine example of the superstition attached to a word removed from its context!

The second quotation is – now hold your breath! – Himmler’s alleged speech in his meeting with Rudolf Höss. Both the meeting itself and the contents of that speech are based solely on assertions by the erstwhile Auschwitz commander!

The reference is to this most dubious document, in which Höss (or the British captors who tortured him) claimed that Himmler had declared in summer of 1941 (!) that the alleged “extermination camps in the east” already existed:[\[633\]](#)

“The extermination centers that presently exist in the east are in no position at all to cope with the great actions being planned.”

Needless to say, the authors are careful not to quote this passage, which by itself renders Höss’ entire little tale absolutely worthless.

The third quote is that infamous sentence from the Posen speech, in which the term “*Judenevakuierung*” (evacuation of Jews) is made the synonym of “*Ausrottung*” in a section entitled “*Die Judenevakuierung*” (the evacuation of Jews):[\[634\]](#)

“I am now talking of the evacuation of the Jews, of the extermination of the Jewish people.”

And because Himmler had used the verb “*ausrotten*” in the sense of “assassinate” in January of 1937, it follows that in October of 1943 “*Ausrottung*” necessarily meant “assassination”!

Of course none of those self-styled specialists of historiographical method has ever asked themselves, if, by any chance, it might not be just the other way around, with “*Ausrottung*” standing for “*Evakuierung*.” Actually, in Hitler’s speeches examined above the “*Vernichtung*” or “*Ausrottung*” of the Jewish people was merely its political extermination by means of deportation or *evacuation* to eastern non-European areas.

As far as the reference to 100, 500, or 1000 corpses is concerned – “most of you will know what it means when 100 corpses are lying together, when 500 are lying there or when 1000 are lying there” – these figures have little to do with the alleged policy of physical extermination because the alleged extermination camps in the east allegedly produced several thousands of corpses every day.

Himmler’s figures, on the other hand, fit in very well with German repressive activities such as those during the Warsaw ghetto uprising, in which some 7,500 Jews were killed. Officially, the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto were scheduled for a “*Judenevakuierung*” to the eastern territories. [\[635\]](#)

Gerhard Rudolf had suggested another quite plausible interpretation of this passage. [\[636\]](#) According to this, this passage refers to those Germans with their “decent Jews,” who did not understand the hard measures against the Jews, because they have never seen hundreds or thousands of corpses. Himmler said:

“All those who speak that way have never watched, have never faced it out.”

But no *Jewish* corpses can be meant by this, because if those Germans with their “great Jews” had seen hundreds of Jewish corpses, they would have understood the harsh anti-Jewish measures even less, or they may even have revolted against them. But Himmler’s audience consisting of soldiers – all of them high-ranking soldiers of the SS, Waffen-SS, and Wehrmacht – understood such harsh anti-Jewish measures because they have seen many corpses. But even those soldiers would not have been inclined to better understand harsh measure against Jews by the mere sight of Jewish corpses. Harsh measures are only likely to be accepted, if one is convinced that they are just, that is: as punishment. But punishment for what? For the massive

occurrence of death; for the Jews' alleged responsibility for the war. Just pay attention to the oft-repeated words of Hitler: "If the international Jewish financiers [...] were to be able to push the peoples once more into a world war," then woe to them! Jewry, so Hitler, "has on its conscience the two million dead of the Great War [WWI], and now it has hundreds of thousands more" (see next chapter). These are the corpses that would allegedly have made the Germans, who think that Jews are nice people, accept the anti-Jewish measures. These are the corpses that made Himmler's audience understand why harsh measures against the Jews were justified and why Himmler and his listeners were emotionally hardened and did not give any mercy.

Obviously, the trick with those extrapolated quotations can only work if quotations that do not fit in with the authors' ideological or political prejudices are not mentioned, such as the declaration Himmler made at Bad Tölz on November 23, 1942:[\[637\]](#)

"The Jewish question in Europe has also completely changed. The Führer once said in a Reichstag speech: If Judaism ever causes a war of extermination of the Aryan peoples, it would not be the Aryan peoples who would be exterminated, but Judaism. The Jew is being evacuated from Germany; he now lives in the east ["lebt im Osten"] and works on our roads, our railways and so on. That process has been implemented coherently, but without cruelty."

3.7.4. Adolf Hitler

On p. 201, the authors discuss David Irving's old thesis that Hitler did not know about the alleged extermination of the Jews,[\[638\]](#) and say:

"His evidence for this is a quote from Hitler, recorded by Bormann's adjutant Heinrich Heim on the day of October 25, 1941:

'From the rostrum of the Reichstag I prophesied to Jewry that if war could not be avoided, the Jews would disappear from Europe. That race of criminals already had on its conscience the two million dead of the Great War, and now it has hundreds of thousands more. Let nobody tell me that despite that [we] cannot park them in the marshy parts of Russia! Our troops are there as well, and who worries about them! By the way – it's not a bad thing that public rumor attributes to us a plan to exterminate Jews.'" (p. 201)

The authors call the presentation and Irving's call for a single document

for or against his thesis a “snapshot fallacy” and continue:

“In Hitler’s War Irving reproduces Himmler’s telephone notes of November 30, 1941, after Hitler requested a meeting with him, showing that the SS chief telephoned Reinhard Heydrich (head of the RSHA) at 1:30 P.M. ‘from Hitler’s bunker at the Wolf’s Lair [Wolfschanze], ordering that there was to be ‘no liquidating’ of Jews (see figure 37).’ Taking this ‘snapshot’ out of its historical context, Irving concludes: ‘The Führer had ordered that the Jews were not to be liquidated’. But let’s re-view this snapshot in the sequence of frames around it. As Raul Hilberg points out, a more accurate translation of the log is ‘Jewish transport from Berlin. No liquidation’. In other words, Himmler is referring to one particular transport, not all Jews. And, ironically, says Hilberg (and Irving concurs in Hitler’s War), ‘that transport was liquidated! That order was either ignored, or it was too late. The transport had already arrived in Riga and they didn’t know what to do with these thousand people so they shot them that very same evening.’” (p. 201)

The note refers to the Jewish transport, which left Berlin for Riga on November 27, 1941.

Actually, it is the authors who avoid the task of inserting this “snapshot” accurately into its context. On the one hand, they keep quiet about Hitler’s other declarations concerning the removal of the European Jews to non-European countries such as Madagascar,[\[639\]](#) or more generally to Africa[\[640\]](#) or to Russia.[\[641\]](#) They also say nothing about his intention of “evacuating all the Jews from Europe after the war,” expressed as early as August of 1940,[\[642\]](#) nor his declaration expressed “repeatedly” that he “wanted to see the solution of the Jewish question set aside until after the war” (“die Lösung der Judenfrage bis nach dem Kriege zurückgestellt wissen wolle”).[\[643\]](#)

Thus, sending the Jews “into the marshy regions of Russia”[\[644\]](#) as mentioned in Hitler’s declaration of October 25, 1941, fits squarely into this context, and the phrase “it’s not a bad thing that public rumor attributes to us a plan to exterminate Jews” – the use of the term “rumor” clearly indicating that such a plan did, in fact, not exist – fits into the historical context of the policy of Jewish emigration. All this constitutes a nice convergence of proof against the theses of the authors.

Let us move on to Himmler’s note of November 30, 1941. On the face of it, the author’s interpretation appears flawless, but “the sequence of frames,”

into which they have inserted this “snapshot,” is artificial. The real historical context is the following:

The “General Report for October 16, 1941, through January 31, 1942” (*Gesamtbericht vom 16. Oktober 1941 bis 31. Januar 1942*) of *Einsatzgruppe A* (the alleged tool for the extermination of Jewish transports from the Reich, including the one that left Berlin on November 27, 1941) contains a full section entitled “*Juden aus dem Reich*” (Jews from the Reich), in which it is said:[\[645\]](#)

“Starting in December of 1940 [actually: 1941], Jewish transports from the Reich arrived at short intervals. 20,000 Jews were directed to Riga and 7,000 to Minsk. The first 10,000 Jews evacuated to Riga were housed partly in a temporary reception camp, partly in a new barrack camp built in the vicinity of Riga. The other transports were settled mainly in a separate section of the Riga ghetto.

The construction of the barrack camp is implemented by the use of all the Jews fit for work in such a way that those who survive the winter can be settled in this camp.

Of the Jews coming from the Reich, only a very small portion is fit for work. Some 70% to 80% are women and children, as well as old people unfit for work. The mortality rate is going up continuously, also because of the extremely severe winter.

The performance of the few Jews from the Reich who are able to work is satisfactory. They are preferred over the Russian Jews on account of their German language and their relatively more pronounced cleanliness.

The capacity of the Jews in trying to adapt their lives to the circumstances is extraordinary. The crowding of the Jews into minute living spaces, which is the case in all ghettos, obviously generates a risk of epidemics, against which measures in the widest way are being undertaken with the aid of Jewish doctors. In rare cases, contagious Jews have been removed and shot, under the pretext of taking them to a clinic or a Jewish hospital.”

Hence, among the Jews deported to Riga from the Reich – including those of the transport of November 27, 1941 – only certain individuals with contagious diseases were killed in individual cases (“*in einzelnen Fällen*”), there were no general measures of “*mass exterminations*.” Hence, if considered with this background in mind, a lot indicates indeed that the term “no liquidation” was referring to these individual cases, which Hitler forbade.

Conclusion

After piling up this enormous heap of falsifications, converging in their negation of the truth, the authors have the audacity to conclude in the hope that their book:

“has not only provided a thorough and thoughtful answer to all the claims of the Holocaust deniers, but also clearly presented the convergence of evidence for how we know the Holocaust (or anything in history) happened.” (p. 259)

What the authors have really furnished is an amateurish and confused answer to a small part of the arguments of a small part of the revisionist scholars, and what they have clearly presented is only a convergence of contortions, omissions, and fallacious interpretations, which do nothing but demonstrate the total inconsistency of the “evidence” for the Holocaust.

And what the authors claim to have demolished is not historical revisionism but a ridiculous parody of historical revisionism. They have massacred their own methodic rulebook by showing the unreliability of their selection of historical facts, utilizing unverified and incestuous sources, never trying to refute their own theses but attempting only to find confirmatory evidence, and obscuring anything that might speak against their thesis. They grounded themselves on a purely fictitious “convergence of proofs” and subjected their findings to their personal convictions and prejudices.

In one respect the authors are absolutely right: in the conviction that “the truth will always win out when the evidence is made available for all to see.”

This is true, above all, for the authors themselves who, like all of their ilk, put all their money on the ignorance of their readers: once the evidence for their falsifications is made available and accessible to all, truth cannot but prevail.

The International Auschwitz Controversy

By Germar Rudolf

It was not before 1989, 44 years after the liberation of the POW and concentration camp complex known as Auschwitz, that an international dispute started about the actual number of victims who had died in this camp complex. For 44 years, the Polish authorities and with them most of the world's mass media had been claiming that some four million inmates had perished there, but in 1989 they suddenly changed their minds and reduced this figure drastically. As a consequence, the memorial plates on display in the camp Auschwitz-Birkenau were removed in 1990, which had propagated the four million figure in many languages. Following this dispute, an investigative commission was formed to come up with a more acceptable number of victims.[\[646\]](#) When this commission published its results in summer of 1990, they were widely distributed by the international media. [\[647\]](#) The most astounding admission came perhaps from a prominent Polish journalist, who stated that the old, exaggerated figure was an “anti-fascist lie.”[\[648\]](#) New memorial plates were installed in Auschwitz in 1995, claiming an alleged “final” victim count of 1.5 millions.

However, this “final” verdict did not end the controversy about the actual death toll of Auschwitz. In 1993 and 1994, the French pharmacist Jean-Claude Pressac, then promoted by the international media as *the* expert on technical questions surrounding Auschwitz, reduced this figure twice, first down to 800,000,[\[649\]](#) then down to 700,000.[\[650\]](#) The next reduction down to some 550,000 followed in May 2002 by Fritjof Meyer, a leading journalist of Germany's biggest news magazine, the left-wing *Der Spiegel*. Meyer's article appeared in the German geopolitical magazine *Osteuropa*, which is published by the German Society for Eastern Europe under the directorship of Prof. Rita Süßmuth, who was once the president of the German parliament. Meyer came to his conclusions by de-commissioning the Auschwitz crematoria as locations of mass murder, that is to say, by claiming that the alleged homicidal gas chambers in those crematoria buildings were never really used as such.

Since this periodical has a very small circulation, the article went largely

unnoticed by the public at large. Only a few German mainstream media took notice of it, so for example Sven Felix Kellerhoff in the German daily newspaper *Die Welt* of August 28, 2002. Other than that, Meyer's article had an echo only in small German right-wing publications.

The Polish Auschwitz Museum, however, reacted promptly to Meyer's new and radical reduction of the Auschwitz death toll and de-commissioning of the crematoria. Dr. Franciszek Piper, chief historian of the museum, wrote a rebuttal to Meyer's paper,[\[651\]](#) to which Meyer responded in turn.[\[652\]](#) A major German anti-fascist website posted links to these and related contributions by other authors on one of their web pages.[\[653\]](#)

Revisionists responded numerous times to Meyer's article,[\[654\]](#) Piper's rebuttal,[\[655\]](#) and Meyer's response in self-defense,[\[656\]](#) demonstrating that both the semi-revisionist Meyer and the dogmatist Piper ignore documentary and physical evidence contradicting their thesis. In a perfect example of pseudo-scholarship, the entire discussion ensuing between established Holocaust scholars was subsequently conducted without a single reference to these revisionist responses, not to mention addressing the points of critique made.

This controversy about the number of Auschwitz victims finally reached international pseudo-academic dimensions, when Meyer's paper was subjected to a detailed scrutiny by John C. Zimmerman – again under careful avoidance of mentioning revisionist contributions to the issue – in the prestigious English language magazine *Journal of Genocide Research*.[\[657\]](#) I will discuss this paper hereafter.

John C. Zimmerman is an assistance professor for accounting at the University of Nevada in Las Vegas. Defending the Holocaust Dogma is one of his spare time hobbies. In 2000, he published a “refutation” of Holocaust revisionism.[\[658\]](#) Many of Zimmerman's essays have been posted on the Internet mainly by the so-called Holocaust History Project (holocaust-history.org). With the paper discussed here, Zimmerman has been accepted as a kind of official Auschwitz expert. This raises the question, as to why the uncounted numbers of full-time Holocaust experts all over the world do not address the theses published by Fritjof Meyer. This even more so, as Carlo Mattogno has thoroughly documented the utter incompetence of Zimmerman in his contribution on this imposter in the present book.[\[659\]](#)

Right at the beginning of the paper at issue, Zimmerman states that he only bothers discussing Meyer's hypothesis because Meyer's victim number

has the potential to get into the mainstream, where it could be quoted as an acceptable number by authors and historians not familiar with the demographics of Auschwitz (p. 249). And that has to be prevented, Zimmerman claims.

On pp. 250-255, Zimmerman tackles the questions: how many prisoners were deported altogether toward Auschwitz railway station, how many of them were registered in the camp, and how many of those not registered were either transferred elsewhere or killed by gas? Revisionists and exterminationists argue only what happened to those inmates, about whose fate we have no other evidence than general witness statements.

This lack of evidence is acknowledged by Zimmerman, who admits that in the years 1942-1944 numerous transports arrived in Auschwitz, bringing inmates that were never registered in the camp and for which there is “no information” about their fate. But in spite of this total lack of any information, Zimmerman claims that those prisoners were gassed. (p. 251)

“No information” means in plain English: no information also about their alleged fate of having been gassed.

That there are indeed cases where it can be shown that deportees sent to Auschwitz, but not registered there, were *not* killed by means of poisonous gas, is even admitted by Zimmerman. As an alternative to the claim of immediate extermination on arrival, he mentions that during 1944 thousands of Jews deported from Hungary and Poland were temporarily quartered in the transit section of the camp (*Durchgangslager*) before transferred to other camps. These inmates never received any registration numbers (p. 252). Of course, Zimmerman cannot come up with a single document indicating the mass murder of unregistered deportees, but he quotes a document which deals with the mass transfer of unregistered Jews to other camps. This is a memo written on May 29, 1944, by First Lieutenant Ferency, delegate of the Hungarian Ministry for the Interior for the deportation of Jews.[\[660\]](#) In it Ferency explains that 184,000 Jews had been deported the previous day and that the Security Police requested that the Jews get food for five days, because they were to be transferred by train to various labor camps after their selection at Auschwitz (p. 253).

Zimmerman argues that all those Jews not registered in Auschwitz and about whose fate we have no other evidence were gassed in Auschwitz.

It is necessary here to highlight Zimmerman’s perverted way of arguing:

Only a few decades ago, it was considered a “certainty” that every

transport arriving at Auschwitz was subjected to a selection process, during which those unfit for labor were separated and killed “by gas.” That was especially true for the Jews deported from Hungary. During the past decades, however, it turned out that many assumed to have been exterminated had not been gassed after all, but were merely transferred to other camps. Zimmerman mentions a few cases himself. In their study about the Stutthof camp, Jürgen Graf and Carlo Mattogno have pointed out more such cases. [\[661\]](#)

In other words: inmates, about whose fate there was no information for many years, suddenly turned out to have been very much alive.

How is it then possible to claim, as Zimmerman does, that all those inmates died “in the gas,” about whose fate we still have no information today?

Zimmerman is correct when claiming that many German authorities were instructed toward the end of the war to destroy their archives (p. 256). But that is a measure taken by all countries who are threatened to be occupied by enemy forces. If each and every such destruction of secret archival material would prove a Holocaust, then we would have one Holocaust after the other everywhere in the world.

Fact is, however, that the Auschwitz authorities did not do anything to hide or destroy any of the tens of thousands of documents of the Central Construction Office of Auschwitz, which would have, after all, contained the evidence of the mass murder claimed by Zimmerman. Fact is, however, that these documents do not only contain *no* evidence for mass murder at all, but to the contrary: they refute such claims.

It remains a fact that the absence of evidence cannot serve as proof for a claim. But that is exactly what Zimmerman is doing. That flies into the face of scientific methods.

An analysis of Zimmerman’s chapter about the capacity of the crematoria in Auschwitz, starting at p. 255, quickly reveals how weak the basis is, upon which Zimmerman tries to erect his thesis. Comparable to the earlier works by Pressac, Zimmerman as well considers it unnecessary to consult technical expert literature or to perform his own technical calculations when trying to solve a technical problem. He relies completely upon witness testimonies and documents, which he picks selectively without any critical analysis. It is also indicative that Zimmerman does not mention the works of his arch enemy Carlo Mattogno with a single word in this paper. Until recently, attempts in

refuting Matogno's works was one of Zimmerman's main objectives.[\[662\]](#) But when publishing in an allegedly scientific journal, he suddenly forgets the most important scientific principle: to mention and discuss contrary evidence and opinions. So much for Zimmerman's scholarly standards.

In order to justify his artificially increased capacity of the crematoria in Auschwitz-Birkenau, Zimmerman applies five sleights of hand:

1. He declares that the furnaces at Birkenau had a performance as similar ovens in other camps (Gusen camp, pp. 257f.). He ignores that the furnaces in Birkenau were inferior to those other ovens, because they did not have forced draft blowers and had different muffle grills.[\[663\]](#)

2. He claims that the emaciated corpses of Auschwitz could be cremated faster (p. 258), ignoring that, first of all, the claimed gassing victims would not have been emaciated – that would have been true only for inmates incarcerated for an extended period of time and suffering and/or dying from either serious diseases (diarrhea, typhus) or malnutrition. Additionally, emaciated corpses with a low body fat content do not burn faster than corpses with an average content of body fat.

3. He misinterprets a memo by Kurt Prüfer, the engineer responsible for constructing the Birkenau crematorium furnaces, stating that the Birkenau three-muffle ovens had a performance $\frac{1}{3}$ higher than those of double-muffle ovens, as a reduction of cremation time by $\frac{1}{3}$ (p. 258). Performance, however, is a physical term meaning energy per time and corpse. The time required for a cremation was not effected, but the energy, because the three-muffle ovens had only two fire places heating three muffles, so that almost the same energy was required to heat three muffles with three corpses as was required to heat two muffles with two corpses.

4. He repeats the legend that usually three, if not up to eight corpses were cremated at once in a single muffle in Birkenau, relying in this regard on the lying witness[\[664\]](#) Henryk Tauber (pp. 258f.) As proof that such an overloading of the muffles was possible in Auschwitz, Zimmerman quotes newspaper articles of the 1980s and 1990s reporting about cases where civil crematories had illegally cremated many corpses at once in order to gain an advantage in time and thus in efficiency over competitors. Zimmerman should have investigated the features of these modern crematoria and should have compared those to the ovens in Birkenau, which would probably have prevented his error. In comparison

to the coke-fired ovens of Birkenau, modern crematoria have almost gigantic muffles, because:


- a) they have to accommodated quite large coffins at times – in Auschwitz corpses were cremated without coffins – and
- b) almost all modern crematoria operate with gas burners embedded in the muffle walls, which work efficiently only when they have a minimum distance from the coffin.

But even in such cases, the cremation of multiple corpses at once can succeed only if the fuel consumption is increased accordingly, which, as Zimmerman himself writes, lead to a fire in one of the cases he quotes, because the overcrowded muffle lead to an overheating of oven and flues.

Documents as well as pictures of the ovens in Auschwitz prove that they had been designed for single corpse cremations only. For example, the oven doors were only 600 mm × 600 mm small (23.5 inches), the upper half of which was a rounded arch. The height of the oven door was further restricted by rollers at the bottom, on which the stretcher was pushed into the muffle (see illustrations 1-3). Hence, the doors alone are clear proof for the fact that these muffles were built for single corpse cremation. But there are also thermotechnical reasons why multiple corpse cremations cannot work: Several corpses in one muffle would have blocked the gas conduits in the muffle walls, through which the combustion gases flowed. Furthermore, the gas generator could not produce the heat required for the initial phase of dehydration, so the ovens would cool down drastically at the beginning. During the following phase of incineration, the burning corpses would produce too much heat, overheating the muffle.[\[666\]](#) As chief engineer Kurt Prüfer put it when two corpses were once inserted simultaneously:[\[667\]](#)

“The ovens could not keep up with this load”

5. Zimmerman doubts the times given by Meyer – who is in turn relying on Mattogno’s statements – during which the crematoria were inoperable. He conjectures that repair orders for




Ill. 1: Oven doors of the type used in the Auschwitz crematoria. Rollers to guide stretcher marked with white ellipses.[\[665\]](#)



oven doors do not necessarily mean that the affected ovens had been shut down. This may or may not be the case.[\[670\]](#) Due to lack of more detailed information, we can currently only speculate about that. But the fact is that Mattogno has documented many cases where the crematoria were indeed inoperable – Zimmerman ignores them all – and in some cases, where Mattogno had only insufficient data, he has estimated cautiously. For long periods of time during the existence of the crematoria, we do not have any documents about their activities. But instead of following Zimmerman’s method: “the lack of evidence proves that the crematoria did not operate,” Mattogno assumed the worst case: Where there is no evidence, he assumes full operation of the ovens.

In various occasions, Zimmerman proves that he does not know the documents. For instance, he calls the operators of the ovens “Sonderkommando” (p. 254), even though they were never called that way.[\[671\]](#) He thinks that the construction of additional morgues through various camps proves that the morgues of the crematoria could no longer be used as morgues, hence, that they served as gas chambers (p. 255). The fact is that these additional morgues served only to temporarily store corpses – mainly overnight and in order to keep rats out – before they were transported to the morgues of the crematoria.[\[672\]](#) Finally, Zimmerman repeats Meyer’s mistake by misquoting a statement by former camp commander Rudolf Höss. In his statement, Höss did not claim that the crematoria could operate only eight to ten hours a day, as Meyer and Zimmerman claim (p. 260), but eight to ten weeks.¹⁰



III. 2: Oven doors of crematorium II in Birkenau.[\[668\]](#)



III. 3: Same doors – with humans around to compare sizes – at the crematorium in Buchenwald.[\[669\]](#)



J. A. TOPF & SOHNE 87/30
 Maschinenfabrik
 Feuerungstechnisches Baugeschäft
 ERFURT, den 16. April 1942

Versandanzeige

An die Zentral-Bauleitung der Waffen SS und Polizei
 Konzentrationslager Auschwitz
 Auschwitz O/S.

Hierdurch teilen wir Ihnen mit, daß wir heute folgende Sendung auf den Weg
 brachten: p. Waggon — ~~Zentral-Bauleitung der Waffen SS und Polizei~~ nach Station:
 Auschwitz O/S.
 Waggon-Nr. 4.627o3.B.M.B.

J. A. TOPF & SOHNE
 VERSANDABTEILUNG

Signum	Unsere Auftrag-Nr.	Art der Verpackung Kollizahl	Stückzahl	Gegenstand	Gewicht in kg Netto Brutto
J.A.T. & S.	41/2249/1			Teile zu den Topf-Dreimuffel-Ofen:	
	27621	10 lose	10	Einführtüren 600/600 mm i.l. 7 rechts, 3 links	2290 2290
		28/ "	28	Feuertüren 280 x 350 i.l.	1274 1274
		28 "	28	Einsatz-Schamottesteine dazu	228 228
		41 "	41	Luftkanalverschlüsse 108/128	307 307
		2 "	2	Einlassschachtverschlüsse	100 100

III. 4: Delivery notice (cropped) from April 16, 1942, by the Topf firm for parts of the Auschwitz three-muffle cremation ovens: "10 introduction doors 600/600 mm"

Zimmerman's statements about the alleged open air incinerations in deep pits contain nothing new, perhaps apart from a reference to a more recently released British air photo of the Birkenau camp, where a small plume of smoke can be spotted rising from the back yard of crematorium V. Zimmerman claims that this smoke rises from a mass grave (p. 261).

It is true that smoke rises from a tiny area behind the crematorium V, but it is of course impossible to recognize what kind of a fire caused the smoke. And apart from this, the photo mentioned by Zimmerman is lacking all the evidence that should be there, should the theory of mass extermination in huge pits be true, as Zimmerman and his friends claim: gigantic pits to the west and north of the camp; gigantic stacks of fuel; fires with smoke plumes covering huge areas; considering the high water table in this swampy area, large areas around those fires would have turned into a huge morass. Nothing remotely similar to this can be seen on this or comparable photos.[\[673\]](#)

At the end, Zimmerman tries to salvage the credibility of the statement extracted from Rudolf Höss by the British by means of torture. He does that by claiming that he made similar statements while in Polish custody.

Zimmerman claims that Höss was treated nicely while awaiting his lynching party in a Polish prison, but he missed the following lines in Höss' statement about his Polish captors:[\[674\]](#)

“During the first weeks the incarceration was quite tolerable, but all at once they [the wardens] were exchanged. From their conduct and their talks, which I could not understand but interpret, I could gather that they wanted to finish me off. I always got the smallest piece of bread and only a small ladle of thin soup. [...]

If the prosecutor had not intervened, they would have finished me of – not just physically, but first of all psychologically.”

Although he could cope with quite a lot, so he continued, the psychological torture he was exposed to by his wardens was too much for him.

Here we see the typical tactics “with a carrot and a stick,” which was mastered in particular by the Stalinist henchmen, who held Höss captive: First an inmate is mistreated by the “evil” guys, and after that the “good” guys tell him that this will not happen again and that he will be just fine, if only he is cooperative with their demands. As is known, Höss was treated so well by the Poles that shortly thereafter he was dangling from the gallows.

The exactitude and reliability of Höss' statements and memoirs, as claimed by Zimmerman, can be deduced, i.a., from the following quotations:²⁹

“Maintaining the fire at the pits, pouring the collected fat [over the burning bodies ...] . They ate and smoked while dragging corpses [...] ” (p. 126)

“The bodies were doused first with oil residues, and later with methanol. [...] He also attempted to destroy the bodies with explosives, [...] ” (pp. 157ff.)

“Half an hour after the introduction of the gas, the door was opened and the ventilation installation was turned on. Removal of the bodies began immediately [...] ” (S. 166.)

I do not have to make any further comment about such nonsense.[\[675\]](#)

So much about Zimmerman's exactitude and reliability.

The Elusive Holes of Death

By Carlo Mattogno

1. Introduction by Germar Rudolf

On August 28, 2002, Sven Felix Kellerhoff of the German daily newspaper *Die Welt* expressed his anger about the semi-revisionist theories of Fritjof Meyer, a leading editor of Germany's largest news magazines *Der Spiegel*. In 2002, Meyer had published an article, in which he reduced the death toll of Auschwitz down to half a million victims, and also decommissioned the gas chambers that were allegedly located in the crematoria of Auschwitz.^[676] Kellerhoff called Meyer a "crown witness" for the "Holocaust deniers."^[677] In early 2004, Meyer himself made an end – perhaps only temporarily so – to this public exchange. In an Open Letter of February 12, 2004, he declared, i.a.:^[678]

"Now the impression grows that they ["right-wing radicals" or "Auschwitz deniers"] could succeed to instrumentalize my theses: for a propaganda of minimization. I therefore do not wish to continue this debate in this forum."

In the following sentence, Meyer's mask drops, and he reveals himself as the left-wing extremist he is, who is promoting the use of violence as a means of solving conflicts:

"Considering the current dangers in Italy, France, Russia, and the U.S., it remains true that the fascists need to be beaten up wherever one encounters them."

With this statement, Meyer has discredited himself utterly as a partner for any future discussion. But that did not, of course, mean that the entire discussion has ended with this epilogue. One of the most ambitious opponents of revisionism, John C. Zimmerman, has scolded Meyer harshly for his semi-revisionist stance.² The latest attack against revisionists came again from the above mentioned Sven Felix Kellerhoff, published in *Die Welt* of August 23, 2004. Under the headline "The Holes of Death," he quotes Robert Faurisson's provocative quip "No holes, no Holocaust" and writes:

"The French revisionist Robert Faurisson repeats it over and over again; David Irving also used it in this sense. Despite the uncouth nature of this quip, the core of it is the question whether or not each of the smaller basement rooms of the crematoria II and III in the extermination camp Birkenau was used as a gas chamber."

In the larger basement room, situated along the axis of the crematorium building above ground, the victims had to undress before

they were pressed, sometimes up to 1000 of them, into the small basement room of some 210 square meters, which was perpendicular to the other. Then SS men threw the poison, hydrogen cyanide bound on diatomaceous earth (Zyklon B), through openings in the ceiling into wire mesh columns in the basement. Within half an hour, the hydrogen cyanide evaporated due to the heat of the bodies and killed every human life.”

The question of the alleged misuse of the basement rooms of crematoria II & III in the Auschwitz-Birkenau camp for mass murder with poison gas is in the very focus of revisionist discussion on the Holocaust. Many monographs and papers appeared about it,[\[679\]](#) one of which was solely dedicated to discuss the issue of the Zyklon B introduction holes.[\[680\]](#) Kellerhoff’s summary of the revisionist viewpoint puts it well:

“Faurisson, Irving & Co. claim that there were no openings in the roof. Therefore, no Zyklon B could have been thrown into the murder chambers. Hence, the Holocaust is an invention.”

Subsequently, however, Kellerhoff dares treading on the minefield of evidence, where he exposes his lack of competence when claiming, “a photo taken during the construction of the murder plant and two air photos taken by the Allies in August 1944” prove the existence of introduction holes. But this is definitely not the case, as I have repeatedly shown.[\[681\]](#) Kellerhoff’s claim is based upon a false interpretation of these pictures, a fact which is admitted even by adherents of the gas chamber theses.[\[682\]](#)

The total lack of documents for the existence of these introduction holes as well as the total lack of any physical trace of these holes in the roof of the ruins of crematorium II in Birkenau, as it has been claimed for decades by revisionists, forced the Holocausters finally to tackle the issue. Sven Kellerhoff gladly announces the result of such research:

“In the journal ‘Holocaust and Genocide Studies,’ three coworkers of the research network ‘Holocaust History Project’^{[\[683\]](#)} exhaustingly clarify the question of the holes in the roof. Daniel Keren, Jamie McCarthy, and Harry W. Mazal have investigated the ruins of both gas chambers in Birkenau as well as the gas chamber in the Auschwitz main camp.

Their result matches exactly the circumstantial evidence known and preserved so far: the smaller basement room of crematorium II had four openings in its roof measuring roughly 60 centimeters in square. [...] The U.S. scientist could identify three of four openings in the ruins; the fourth

is covered by debris. All alleged ‘arguments’ of the Auschwitz deniers are thus refuted on the basis of physically provable facts: The smaller basement rooms of both crematorium buildings were equipped with gas chambers and were used as such to kill hundreds of thousands of human beings. The case of the openings in the roof of the gas chamber in the crematorium of the main camp is a little more complicated. [...]”

As indicated above, the crematorium in the main camp is not the only case that is a little more complicated than Kellerhoff suggests. A final answer to this question will be given only after the arguments of both sides have been weighed objectively, something that Kellerhoff, with his dogmatic attitude, will probably never accept.

It is already indicative that the three authors mentioned by Kellerhoff – Keren, McCarthy, and Mazal – have never published before in the field of Holocaust research. They also refused to even take notice of a thorough study on this issue by revisionist scholar Carlo Mattogno,⁵ which had been published in English on the internet as early as 2002.[\[684\]](#) Hence, Keren, McCarthy, and Mazal did not weigh arguments, but confirmed prejudices, which quickly gained the predicate of “scientific self-evidence” by the Holocaust lobby by virtue of having it published in the most renowned journal these genocide researchers have at their hands.

In the following, I give the word to the world’s unchallenged expert on Auschwitz, Carlo Mattogno. This may result in Kellerhoff and his “hole heroes” losing their wits, which in turn might lead to them resorting to character assassination, something they are good at, since they have exercised it before.[\[685\]](#)

In concluding I may state that this episode in the controversy over the Holocaust between revisionists and exterminationists proves – to quote Galileo Galilei freely: Something moves after all!

The discussion about the reality of Holocaust claims, which the establishment wants to suppress so badly, is already going on. It has hit the scholarly journals of the establishment. There is no way back anymore, because we revisionists won’t let go!

2. “No Holes, No Gas Chamber(s)”

When American expert for execution techniques Fred A. Leuchter presented his famous expert report on the gas chambers of Auschwitz and Majdanek to a Canadian court in 1988, he initially caused confusion: in his technical drawings of the morgues no. 1 of the crematoria II and III of Auschwitz-Birkenau, which allegedly served as “gas chambers,” he had drawn in four openings in the roof, through which, according to witnesses accounts, the insecticide Zyklon B had been poured in order to kill hundreds of thousands of victims. It was only in a later edition of this expert report that Leuchter added a letter to the report, in which he explained that those four holes could not be found in the ruins of those crematoria.

The Swede Ditlieb Felderer was the first, in the 1970s, to raise the question whether or not there were any holes in those roofs, without which those basements could not have served as execution chambers in the way as testified to by witnesses.[\[686\]](#) Ever since then, this issue has been discussed intensely. Up to the current paper, this topic was most thoroughly treated by Germar Rudolf in his *Rudolf-Report*.[\[687\]](#) Inspired by Rudolf’s arguments, Charles D. Provan compiled a study, which is analyzed by Carlo Mattogno in the following paper. Provan’s study is based primarily on illustrations of the roof of this morgue as it looked like in 2000. To summarize Provan, he thinks that he has identified at least three holes in the roof of morgue no. 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau, which could have served as introduction holes in 1943/1944. Provan concludes therefore that the quip coined by Prof. Dr. Robert Faurisson, and supported by G. Rudolf with evidence – “No Holes, no Holocaust” – is untenable. Carlo Mattogno shows in the following that Provan’s assertions themselves are untenable. All of his alleged holes are demonstrably the result of the destruction of the crematoriums during the retreat of German troops or were created only after war’s end.

2.1. Introduction

Charles D. Provan is the author of a pamphlet entitled, “No Holes? No Holocaust? A Study of the Holes in the Roof of morgue 1 of Krematorium 2 at Birkenau.”[\[688\]](#) First of all Provan emphasizes the importance of the

problem of the holes for the introduction of Zyklon B into the presumed homicidal gas chamber of crematorium II. This question, raised by historical revisionists, obtained much prominence in 2000 during the trial *David Irving versus Penguin Books Ltd. and Deborah E. Lipstadt*. It was also discussed by Justice Gray in the written verdict.[\[689\]](#)

In his study, Provan analyzes the five categories comprising the evidence for these presumed holes, which are generally accepted by the supporters of the thesis of gas chambers at Auschwitz-Birkenau:

1. Witnesses and early historical testimony
2. Air photo evidence of the holes in the roofs of the gas chambers
3. The blueprints of morgue 1, Krematorium 2
4. German wartime photographs of morgue 1 of Krematoria 2 and 3
5. Physical evidence

In the first category Provan cites 16 testimonies from 9 major witnesses and 7 minor witnesses (pp. 3-9).

He then examines the statements of minor witnesses (pp. 10f.) in the following order: Egon Ochshorn, Dr. Friedmann, Janda Weiss, Rudolf Vrba and Alfred Wetzler, Ota Kraus and Erich Kulka, Werner Krumme and Alfred Franke-Gricksch. Provan concludes that these are unreliable. For the major witnesses (in order, Rudolf Höss, Henryk Tauber, Karl Schultze, Salmen Lewental, Konrad Morgen, Miklos Nyiszli, “Paul” Bendel, Josef Erber, and Filip Müller – all of whom were “eyewitnesses”), Provan provides no analysis: he assumes *a priori* that these are reliable. But these testimonies are in fact dubious as well, as we shall subsequently see.

As to the rest, Provan bases his arguments on only four testimonies:

1. Henryk Tauber for the arrangement and number of holes for the introduction of Zyklon B (two on the east side and two on the west side of morgue 1).
2. Karl Schultze for the dimensions of the holes (cm 25 cm × 25 cm).
3. Konrad Morgen for the crudeness of the extermination facilities.
4. Rudolf Höss for the transformation of the crematoria into instruments of mass extermination without the knowledge of the head of the Central Construction Office.

The other testimonies served as confirmation of these four principal views.

Before examining in detail Provan’s arguments, let us verify the

credibility of the major witnesses cited by him.

2.2. The Major Witnesses Cited by Provan

2.2.1. Josef Erber

This testimony is cited by Provan and dealt with by Gerald Fleming in his book *Hitler and the Final Solution*.^[690] The text cited by Fleming is taken in turn from a letter that Josef Erber wrote to him on September 14, 1981.^[691] The declaration of the witness is therefore already suspect on account of the late date. In the first edition of the above book, which appeared in German with the title *Hitler und die Endlösung*, Fleming quotes from the original text of Erber's letter:^[692]

“Two in pours [Einschütten] were in each of these gassing rooms (of Krematorium one and two in Birkenau, G.F.): inside four iron pipes each from the floor to the roof. These were surrounded by steel wire mesh, and inside was a sheet metal with a low edge. To this a wire was attached, with which the sheet metal could be pulled up to the roof. An iron lid was attached to each in pour [Einschütte] at the roof. If the lid was raised, the tin container could be pulled up and the gas could be poured in. Then the container was lowered and the lid closed.”

What sort of thing is an “in pour” (*Einschütte*)? The verb “*einschütten*” means “pour in(to)” as a technical term; “to feed,” “to charge” or “to load.” If, as it seems, the “*Einschütte*” was a mechanism, it must concern a device for pouring or feeding. Yet, according to the text, there were two “*Einschütten*” in each “gas chamber” of crematoria II and III. These devices are clearly inconsistent with those described by Henryk Tauber, and moreover it is difficult to imagine how they were made. So difficult is it that Provan himself, in order to make the text intelligible, wrote “rooms” (note 24 on p. 7) where Fleming, translating the German term “*Einschütten*,” wrote “ducts.” Even so, the original text categorically excludes this interpretation.

In conclusion, the testimony of Josef Erber is unreliable.^[693]

2.2.2. Konrad Morgen

Provan cites two statements made by this witness (p. 5). The first deals with the affidavit made by Morgen on July 13, 1946, document SS-65. There the witness states:

“In this moment, an SS man in a gas suit stepped over the outer air

duct and poured a can with hydrogen cyanide into the room.”

Morgan talks about a single “air duct,” which contradicts the description accepted by Provan. The term “air duct” is moreover inappropriate in that the presumed holes for introducing Zyklon B had nothing whatsoever to do with ventilation. In crematoria II and III there were in fact a “*Belüftungsschacht*” (aeration duct) and an “*Entlüftungsschacht*” (de-aeration duct) which connected morgue no. 1 to the ventilators, blowing and drawing, and situated in the attic of the structures.[\[694\]](#)

The second citation is inferred from the deposition of Morgen at the trial of Oswald Pohl. The witness confirms here that Zyklon B was introduced into the “gas chamber” through a “special shaft” (p. 5): again, a single introduction device.

How reliable this witness is for the presumed “gas chambers” becomes clear upon examining what he declared during the August 8, 1946, hearing of the Nuremberg trial:[\[695\]](#)

“By ‘Extermination Camp Auschwitz’ I did not mean the concentration camp. It did not exist there. I meant a separate extermination camp near Auschwitz, called ‘Monowitz.’”

A little later he confirmed this:[\[696\]](#)

“These trucks drove off, but they did not drive to the Concentration Camp Auschwitz, but in another direction to the Extermination Camp Monowitz, which was a few kilometers away.”

One could imagine a slip of the tongue: Morgen was thinking of Birkenau but said Monowitz. But that he was thinking literally of Monowitz is revealed by the following statement:[\[697\]](#)

“The Extermination Camp Monowitz lay far away from the concentration camp. It was situated on an extensive industrial site and was not recognizable as such and everywhere on the horizon there were smoking chimneys.”

In fact, there is no doubt about it: in an “extensive industrial site” full of chimneys, he found Monowitz, certainly not Birkenau. Now if Konrad Morgen is an “eyewitness,” how could he confuse Birkenau with Monowitz? It seems that he had seen precisely nothing, but spoke – for the most part incoherently – from hearsay. Therefore, as far as we are concerned, Konrad Morgen is a completely unreliable witness.

2.2.3. “Paul” Bendel

Provan cites via Pressac the short text “Les Crématoires. ‘Le Sonderkommando’” carrying the signature “Paul Bendel,”[\[698\]](#) which appeared in a book published in 1946. Here the author states that the “*chambres à gaz*” (“gas chambers”) in each of crematoria II and III were “*au nombre de deux*” (“in number two”) and adds:[\[699\]](#)

“Made of reinforced concrete, one had the impression when entering that the ceiling would fall on one’s head, so low it was. In the middle of these chambers two pipes surrounded by wire mesh and with an exterior valve served for the emission of gases.”

Provan notices that the presence of two gas chambers is in accord with the declaration of Tauber, according to whom “at the end of 1943, the gas chamber was divided into two by a brick wall to make it possible to gas smaller transports.” (note 20 on p. 6) Therefore Bendel would confirm Tauber. However, matters are not that simple.

It is known that morgue no. 1 of the crematoria II and III measured internally 30 m × 7 m × 2.41 m.[\[700\]](#) At the trial of Bruno Tesch, Bendel testified that “each gas chamber was 10 meters long and 4 meters wide” and that each had a height of 1.60 m:[\[701\]](#)

“Q. You have said that the gas chambers were ten meters by four meters by one meter sixty centimeters: is that correct? A. Yes.”

Previously, on October 21, 1945, Bendel had declared:[\[702\]](#)

“There were 2 gas chambers, underground, roughly 10 meters long, 5 meters wide and 1 ½ meters high, each one.”

Nevertheless, even if morgue 1 of the crematoria II and III had been divided exactly in two, this would have given rise to two localities each measuring 15 m × 7 m × 2.41 m. How can these measurements be reconciled with the quite different ones given by Bendel, that is, 10 m × 4 m × 1.6 m or 10 m × 5 m × 1.5 m?

I well understand that an estimate with the naked eye can be subject to a considerable margin of error, but how could Bendel claim that the ceiling had a height of barely 1.5 or 1.6 m? Here we are no longer dealing with an estimate, since any person of medium height would have had to stoop in order to enter these fictitious places. In the actual localities, however, he would have had more than 60 to 70 cm of space above his head before touching the ceiling. An error in good faith is therefore impossible. But even the errors relative to the length and width of the localities, considering their modest dimensions, are difficult to explain.

Whatever the case, it is impossible for Bendel to have entered a “gas chamber” with a height of 1.5 or 1.6 m, since such localities did not exist, and it is just as impossible that he could have made such a gross error. Therefore he is an unreliable witness.

Strangely, Bendel makes no mention of the presumed “undressing room” (morgue no. 2), even though it had a ceiling 11 cm lower than that of morgue 1![\[703\]](#)

2.2.4. Miklos Nyiszli

Provan cites two passages from the statements of this witness (pp. 5f.). The first goes back to July 28, 1945, and the other to October 8, 1946. Nyiszli mentions four “ventilation valves” equipped with “perforated tubes,” which popped out above the “gas chamber” of crematorium II in “concrete chimneys” closed with “concrete lids.” “Chlorine gas” was introduced into these “valves.”

In 1946 Nyiszli published a book of memoirs in Hungarian with the title *I was Dr. Mengele’s Anatomist at an Auschwitz Crematorium*,[\[704\]](#) of which there was an English translation published in the USA. Among other things it contains an detailed description of the basement of crematorium II:[\[705\]](#)

“The room^{[\[706\]](#)} into which the convoy proceeded was about 200 meters long:^{[\[707\]](#)} its walls were whitewashed and it was brightly lit. [...].

Making his way through the crowd, an SS opened the swing-doors of the large oaken gate at the end of the room. The crowd flowed through it into another, equally well-lighted room. This second room^{[\[708\]](#)} was the same size as the first^{[\[709\]](#)} but neither benches nor pegs were to be seen. In the center of the rooms, at thirty-yard intervals, columns rose from the concrete floor to the ceiling. They were not supporting columns, but square sheet-iron pipes, the sides of which contained numerous perforations, like a wire lattice. [...]

The Deputy Health Officer held four green sheet-iron canisters. He advanced across the grass, where, every thirty yards,^{[\[710\]](#)} short concrete pipes jutted up from the ground. Having donned his gas mask, he lifted the lid of the pipe, which was also made of concrete. He opened one of the cans and poured the contents – a mauve granulated material – into the opening. The granulated substance fell in a lump to the bottom. The gas it produced escaped through the perforations, and within a few seconds filled the room in which the deportees were stacked. Within five minutes

everybody was dead.”

The English translation omits the following phrase from the last passage:²⁵

“A beszórt anyag Cyclon, vagy Chlór szemcsés formája, azonnal gázt fejleszt, amint a levegővel érintkezik!”

That is:

“The scattered substance is Cyclon or chlorine in granular form, the gas develops immediately, hardly coming into contact with air!”

Let us recapitulate. Miklos Nyiszli, in contradiction to the plans and the ruins of the crematoria, maintains that morgue 2 had a length of 200 meters, while in reality it measured 49.49m,[\[711\]](#) and that likewise morgue 1 had a length of 200 meters, while in fact its length was 30 meters. In the “gas chamber” there were four devices for the introduction of Zyklon B, but they were separated from each other by 30 meters – the entire length of the site!

Perhaps the omission in the English translation of the above passage from the original Hungarian happened by chance, but the fact remains that it gives rise to another absurdity: as everyone knows, the toxic agent of Zyklon B was not chlorine, but rather hydrogen cyanide.

The description given by witness Nyiszli presents many more incredible blunders. For example, he maintains that there were four elevators in the basement of crematorium II:[\[712\]](#)

“Four good-sized elevators were functioning [here]”

It is well known that there was but a single elevator.

In addition, he maintains that in the furnace room of crematorium II there were 15 single ovens:[\[713\]](#)

“Each of these fifteen ovens was housed in a red brick structure.”

In crematorium II (and III) there were in fact 5 ovens, each with 3 muffles, and so there were five brick structures, not fifteen.

Nyszli claims to have spent eight months[\[714\]](#) (from May 1944 to January 1945) in the so-called “Sonderkommando” of the crematoria; that is, for six months his lodging was located on the ground floor of crematorium II.[\[715\]](#) He should then have had a perfect knowledge of crematorium II. So how could he have been so grossly mistaken in good faith about the dimensions of the facilities, the number of elevators and the structure of the ovens? And, since he was a medical man who presumably assisted at various “gassings,” how could he maintain that the toxic agent of Zyklon B was chlorine?

It is therefore evident that this witness is absolutely unreliable.[\[716\]](#)

A final observation: according to Nyiszli there was a single gas chamber

in crematorium II, while according to Tauber the “gas chamber” was subdivided into two at the end of 1943. On the other hand, there is the witness Bendel, who, in his own words, became a member of the so-called “Sonderkommando” of the crematoria in June 1944.^[717] In the same period and in the same place, Bendel “saw” two “gas chambers”^[718] of 10 meters’ length, while Nyiszli saw one “gas chamber” there of 200 meters’ length. How can these statements be reconciled?^[719]

2.2.5. Filip Müller

The testimony of Filip Müller is pitifully late, going back only to 1979. He describes in the following way the devices for the introduction of Zyklon B:^[720]

“The Zyklon B gas crystals^[721] were thrown through openings in the concrete ceiling, which ended in hollow sheet metal columns in the gas chamber. These were perforated equidistantly, and inside of them a spiral ran from top to bottom, to achieve a distribution of the grainy crystals as equally as possible.”

This description is very vague. Müller indicates neither the number nor the shape nor the dimensions nor the positions of either the holes or the columns. This last point takes on major significance from the fact that Filip Müller published a plan of crematorium II complete with “criminal” captions:^[722] an excellent but lost opportunity to indicate the positions of the holes in the ceiling of morgue 1!

From such a witness, who claims to have spent “three years in the crematoria and gas chambers of Auschwitz” (as the subtitle of his book informs us), one expects something better than this dull description.

But this should not surprise us. As I have indicated elsewhere, here as in many other important places of his book, Filip Müller has done no more than plagiarize the account given by Miklos Nyiszli, of which the German translation appeared in 1961 in the magazine *Quick* published in Munich, Bavaria.^[723]

In this specific case Müller has added on his own the odd idea of the spiral – as though Zyklon B could evaporate during the few seconds it spent spiraling down this chute before arriving at the long floor!

2.2.6. Salmen Lewenthal

This witness is even more vague than Filip Müller. From the passage cited

by Provan (p. 5), one cannot even gather the number of “small upper doors.” I will subsequently return to the witnesses Höss, Schultze and Tauber.

2.3. The Air Photos

In paragraph III (pp. 12-14) Provan examines the photographs taken by the United States Air Force during the war. In some of the photographs of the roofs of morgue 1 of crematoria II and III, such as in the one taken on August 25, 1944, there appear irregular dark patches that – as Provan recalls – Brugioni and Poirier have interpreted since 1979 as “vents used to insert the Zyklon-B crystals.” Since then, these patches have become a “proof” of the existence of devices for introducing Zyklon B into the presumed homicidal gas chambers.

Provan is not in agreement with the interpretation of Brugioni and Poirier and maintains:

“No matter what one thinks of the authenticity of the smudgy marks, it is impossible to view them, whether authentic or not, as ‘vents.’” (p. 13)

Provan concludes:

“So we are hesitant to use the aerial photographs as proof that there were roof vents for Zyklon B.” (p. 14)

In fact, the interpretation of Brugioni and Poirier creates insuperable difficulties. The first is that these patches are not shadows. At the second (1988) trial of Zündel, Kenneth R. Wilson, an expert in photogrammetry and aerial triangulation, testified – according to Barbara Kulaszka’s report – that in the air photo of May 31, 1944, “the patches on top of the morgue at crematorium II were flat and had no elevation.” As for the photograph of August 25, 1944, “he determined that the patches were not shadows but did not have any elevation.”[\[724\]](#)

In the second place, as other authors have since pointed out,[\[725\]](#) in the photograph of August 25, 1944, the patches on the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II have lengths of 3-4 meters, and those on the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium III have a minimum area of three square meters. Moreover, all the patches have their axis oriented in a north-south direction, whereas the axis of the chimney’s shadow is aligned in a north-east/south-west direction. Finally, let me add that in the air photo of May 31, 1944 (see Ill. 4), there appears a single dark patch at the western edge of the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II.[\[726\]](#)

Crematorium II of Birkenau, May 31, 1944

Since the above patches were not shadows, what then were they? Kenneth R. Wilson advanced the hypothesis that they were “discolorations on the surface of the roof.”[\[727\]](#) John C. Ball claimed that these are not discolorations of the roof but of the negative, that is, marks that had been put onto the negative by a forger.[\[728\]](#)

There are, however, less radical explanations. For example, the marks may have been by some kind of flat vegetation on the roof, because the morgues were covered with earth to keep them cool. However, this does not explain why these marks are visible on some photos but not on others.

Another explanation could be that the soil covering the morgues had to be removed temporarily for repair purposes. The roofs of morgue 1 of crematoria II and III were made of reinforced concrete 18 cm thick,[\[729\]](#) insulated from rainwater by a layer of bitumen, which was protected from atmospheric agents by a thin layer of cement. It is conceivable that this thin layer of concrete had been damaged, resulting in leaks,[\[730\]](#) which could have led the Central Construction Office to have the soil removed in order to perform the reparations necessary. But it seems more likely that such a soil removal would have been done in large areas, but not in areas merely 3 m long and 1 m wide. There is also no documentary evidence for such repair works.

A final possibility is that the morgues were not at all covered with earth at the time these photos were made, and that the marks indicate areas where the upper concrete layer had been damaged and the lower layer of black bitumen emerged, creating the patches which are seen on the air photos.

2.4. The Plans of Morgue 1 of Crematorium II

Referring to Robert Faurisson’s discovery of the fact that the presumed gas chamber of crematorium II is designated “morgue 1” in the original plans of crematorium II in Birkenau, and that no holes in the ceiling are displayed for this locality, Provan notes:

“Though these two discoveries are important, let us observe that they are in agreement with an interrogation which took place over 50 years ago.” (p. 15)

Next Provan cites an extract from the interrogation that Rudolf Höss underwent on April 1, 1946, which he summarizes and comments upon as

follows:

“Note that Höss mentioned several times that he was forbidden to discuss the execution of the Jews with anyone. Upon his return to Auschwitz he began working on the plans for extermination facilities by instructing his construction chief (whose name was Bischoff). He ordered Bischoff to begin work on a large crematorium, the plans of which were sent to Himmler. Subsequently, Höss figured out the changes needed to convert the crematorium into a homicidal facility, and sent them to Himmler. The changes were approved.” (pp. 15f.)

In concluding, he writes that the “gas chamber” was called “morgue 1” and that no holes were described for the introduction of Zyklon B:

“since the man in charge of it was not permitted to know of its real purpose, and therefore did not draw them on the plans.” (p. 16)

Provan’s conclusion is therefore based on the statements of Rudolf Höss. But are his statements reliable? To answer this question let us now examine the context in which they are placed.

Höss maintained that he received the order to exterminate the Jews in Berlin from Himmler personally in July 1941.[\[731\]](#) On that occasion Himmler explained that

“the extermination camps in Poland that existed at that time were not capable of performing the work assigned to them.”[\[732\]](#)

Then, to a specific query of the interrogator, Höss responded:

“There were three camps: first, Treblinka, Belzak [sic] near Lemberg and the third one was about 40 kilometers in the direction of Kulm. It was past Kulm in an easterly direction.”

The third “extermination camp” should have been Sobibór. Nevertheless, the geographic direction given by Höss is mistaken since “Kulm” corresponds to the Polish “Chelmno,” while the neighboring city of Sobibór is “Chelm,” which in German is called “Cholm.”

Therefore, when Höss claimed that Himmler had informed him that

“the camps in Poland were not suitable for enlargement and the reason why he had chosen Auschwitz was because of the fact it had good railroad connections and could be enlarged”[\[733\]](#)

and ordered him

“to look at an extermination camp in Poland and eliminate in the construction of my camp the mistakes and inefficiency existing in the Polish camp,”[\[734\]](#)

he understood that, according to Himmler, in July 1941 there already existed the “extermination camps” of Treblinka, Belzec, and Sobibór, exactly as Höss described them during the interrogation of March 14, 1946, when he declared:[735]

“I was ordered to see Himmler in Berlin in June [sic] 1941 and he told me, approximately, the following: The Führer ordered the solution of the Jewish question in Europe. A few so-called extermination camps are existing in the general government (Belzek [Belzec] near Rawa Ruska, eastern Poland, Tublinka [Treblinka] near Malina [Malkinia] on the river Bug, and Wolzek[736] near Lublin.”

Let us now turn to the interrogation of April 1, 1946. Höss declared there that he had visited the Treblinka camp before constructing his extermination facilities at Auschwitz. The purpose of his visit was precisely to “eliminate in the construction” of his “camp the mistakes and inefficiency” of Treblinka. Höss describes at length the presumed extermination procedure at Treblinka, specifying

“at that time the action in connection with the Warsaw Ghetto was in progress, and I watched the procedure.”[737]

Also this description reproduces what Höss declared at the interrogation of March 14, 1946:⁵⁰

“I visited the camp Treblinka in Spring 1942 to inform myself about the conditions. The following method was used in the process of extermination. Small chambers were used equipped with pipes to induce exhaust gas from car engines. This method was unreliable as the engines, coming from old captured transport vehicles and tanks, very often failed to work. Because of that the intakes could not be dealt with according to the plan, which meant to clear the Warsaw Ghetto. According to the Camp Commandant of Treblinka 80,000 people have been gassed in the course of half a year.”

Rudolf Höss recounted the same story also at the interrogation of April 8, 1946:[738]

“I had the order to create extermination facilitations in Auschwitz in June 1941. At that time, three other extermination facilities already existed in the Government General: Belzek, Treblinka, and Wolzek. These camps were under the jurisdiction of the Einsatzkommando of the Security Police and the SD. I visited Treblinka to determine how the exterminations are being executed. The camp commander of Treblinka

told me that he has liquidated 80,000 within half a year. His main task was the liquidation of all the Jews from the Warsaw ghetto. He used carbon monoxide gas, and according to him his method was not efficient. When I erected the extermination building in Auschwitz, I therefore used Zyklon B, a crystalline blue acid [sic], which we threw into the death chamber through small openings.”

So Höss affirmed that in June or July 1941 there were already in existence the camps of Belzec and Treblinka, and that he had visited the Treblinka camp “in Spring 1942,” but before the construction of the “extermination building” at Auschwitz; that is, at the latest before the installation of the so-called “Bunker 1” – which should have entered into service on March 20, 1942,^[739] or in May 1942, according to Pressac.^[740]

Nonetheless, the Belzec camp was opened on March 17, 1942,^[741] and Treblinka on July 23, 1942.^[742] In conclusion, these two camps did not exist in 1941; therefore the statements that Höss attributes to Himmler are false. What is more, since Höss could not have visited Treblinka before the start of the presumed extermination at Auschwitz, his account of it is false.

Thus, the declarations of Höss cited by Provan are contained in this context of manifest historical falsehood. Why then should one believe in their truthfulness?

Hence the context leads one to seriously doubt the reliability of the declarations of Rudolf Höss which Provan cites.

Let us now examine the substance of Rudolf Höss’ statements. He maintains:^[743]

“I immediately got in touch with the chief of a construction unit and told him that I need a large crematorium.”

This took place in June or July 1941 on his return to Auschwitz from the meeting with Himmler in Berlin. Nonetheless, the first plan of the new crematorium – the future crematorium II – was drawn up by SS-Untersturmführer Dejaco on October 24, 1941,^[744] that is, three or four months later, which is hard to reconcile with the adverb “immediately.” The second plan of the crematorium was realized in November 1941 by the architect Werkmann of the SS Main Office Budget and Buildings.^[745] This shows that the construction of this facility was not a local secret affair. Höss then states that he “changed” the plans “in accordance with the real purpose” of Himmler’s instructions – that is, he modified the original plans, thus transforming a simple hygienic and sanitary facility into an instrument for

extermination – and sent these plans so modified to Himmler, who approved of them.[746] The definitive plan for the crematorium was completed at Auschwitz in January 1942.[747] Yet according to Pressac, the first presumed “criminal” modification of these plans can be found in plan no. 2003 of December 19, 1942.[748] Therefore, Höss would have had to have waited twelve months before initiating the criminal modification of the crematorium! I say “initiating” because, as Provan states, the holes in the ceiling of morgue 1 of crematorium II would have been made between the end of January 1943 and the middle of March 1943 (pp. 18f), so that Höss would have had to wait at least another month before carrying out this indispensable modification in order to use the above locality as a homicidal gas chamber. I shall return to this essential point in chapter 2.6.

On the other hand, the claim of Rudolf Höss that he created at Auschwitz installations for extermination without informing the head of the Central Construction Office beforehand is decisively nonsensical, considering our knowledge of the structure, functions, and duties of this office.[749] This is even truer of the presumed “criminal” modifications to crematorium II. In fact, if Bischoff had transformed the so-called “Bunker 1” by May 1942 into a homicidal gas chamber (and in June the so-called “Bunker 2”), and if the mass extermination of the Jews had begun by July 4 at the latest,[750] then Himmler’s “secret” at Auschwitz was revealed and Bischoff could not but have been perfectly informed of it. If so, why then did Höss have to continue transforming crematorium II into an extermination facility, gradually and secretly, without the knowledge of Bischoff who now knew the “secret”?

All this is nonsensical; so the statements of Rudolf Höss are false also on this score.

These assertions are not only false, but they are also contradictory, because in his declaration given at Krakow on January 29, 1947, Rudolf Höss stated:[751]

“Plans for the gas chambers, in which people in Oswiecim were poisoned with Cyklon B, were made by Karl Bischoff, chief of the Construction Office of the concentration camp, and by me. The project was later discussed with the chief of Office Group C, Dr. Ing. Kammler. The construction of the gas chambers was performed by the camp’s Construction Office under the direction of its chief, Bischoff.”

This is exactly the opposite of what Höss said in the declaration of April 1, 1946, quoted by Provan.

A final observation: A further “criminal” modification of the basement of crematorium II was supposed to be the change of the entrance staircase to morgue 2. Even though this entrance was less important to the extermination process than the holes in the ceiling of morgue 1 (because the victims could enter the basement through the entrance on the north side of the crematorium),^[752] this staircase modification does appear in the plan attached to the documentation on the “negotiation of handing over” of the crematorium to the Kommandantur.^[753] But then why do the much more important holes for introducing Zyklon B not appear in this plan?

In conclusion, while it is true that the plans for the crematoria are “in accord with [the respective passages of] the statement of Höss” (p. 30), these “statements” are not “in accord” with historical reality. Therefore Provan’s arguments are altogether untenable.

2.5. The Terrestrial Photographs of Morgue 1

In paragraph V, “German wartime photographs of morgue 1 of crematoria 2 and 3,” Provan analyzes the four photographs adduced by Pressac as proof of the existence of chimneys for the introduction of Zyklon B on the roof of morgue 1, and Provan comes to the conclusion that in reality these prove nothing.

Photograph 1 (negative number 20995/507 from the Auschwitz Museum):

“Try as we might, we cannot see any of these openings on the photograph.” (p. 17)

Photograph 2 (negative number 20995/494 from the Auschwitz Museum):

“It is our conclusion therefore, that whatever they are, they are not the Zyklon B insertion chimneys spoken of by the eyewitnesses.” (p. 18)

Photograph 3 (negative number 20995/460 from the Auschwitz Museum):

“Since the object, whatever it is, isn’t on the roof at all, this is conclusive evidence that it was not a Zyklon B introduction chimney.” (p. 18)

Photograph 4 (negative number 20995/506 from the Auschwitz Museum):

“The roof is covered with snow, and no vents for Zyklon B are visible. Since the picture is dated from January 20-22, 1943, we can deduce that any holes for Zyklon B insertion must have been put in after that date.” (p. 18)

On the subject of photograph 1, some additional remarks can be made,

which I owe mainly to Jean-Marie Boisdefeu. Jean-Claude Pressac^[754] believed that he was able to see on this photograph “openings for the introduction of Zyklon B” on the roof of morgue 1 (see Ill. 1, p. 317). The image was taken from the sewage treatment plant, which was located south of crematorium II and was composed of twelve decantation basins arranged in three rows of four basins each in an east-west direction (or four columns of three basins in a north-south direction). The photographer stood in front (to the south) of the installation, at the third decantation basin (counting from the east) of the first row (from south). The photograph shows, in fact, three decantation basins (in front) and the two foot-bridges which ran along the first two columns of basins (on the right).

The crematorium had ten pairs of windows.^[755] There were eight dormer windows on the roof, somewhat off-set with respect to the pairs of windows. The center of the photograph is roughly below the first pair of windows, at an angle of about 15 degrees, which causes the left edge of the photo to be practically perpendicular to the line of the crematorium building.

On the far left of the photograph, the field of view ends with the eighth pair of windows and the sixth dormer window on the roof. An air photo taken on May 31, 1944, shows the sewage treatment plant and crematorium II with its morgue (see Ill. 2). In the reproduction shown on p. 317, I have marked “A” the point where the photographer stood, “B” is the left hand edge of the field of view and “C” its center. Morgue 1, “L,” was mainly outside of the field of view and could not be seen on the photograph: the only portion visible is the south-eastern corner, but for less than one meter of its width, as is clearly shown by the drawing of the southern façade of the crematorium, of which I present the section which interests us here (Ill. 3). I have marked (8, 9, 10) the eighth, ninth, and tenth window, as well as (6, 7) the sixth and seventh dormer window and (“A”) the left hand edge of the field of view of the photograph in question. Hence, the object which Pressac has taken to be an opening for the introduction of Zyklon B is below the first window of the eighth pair of windows (from east), i.e. completely outside of the surface of the morgue and in the position marked “B” in Ill. 3.

2.6. The Arguments of Pressac and Van Pelt

To Germar Rudolf’s observation that forcing openings through the finished roof of morgue 1 “would truly be an incredibly stupid piece of

bungling ,”[756] Provan responds:

“We do not see why this would be so. We have already seen that Höss could not even tell his SS architect about the building’s real purpose, and we can observe that all of the blueprints call that gas chamber ‘morgue 1.’ [...] So we see no problem with this method being the method of creating Zyklon B holes in the roof of morgue 1.” (p. 19)

This statement deserves an adequate response.

As I have shown in chapter 2.4., Provan’s hypothesis regarding the criminal transformation of the crematoria without the knowledge of the head of the Central Construction Office is completely untenable. Therefore this cannot explain why the roof of morgue 1 was constructed without holes for introducing Zyklon B.

Hence, the question of why the ceiling of morgue 1 of crematorium II was constructed without holes for introducing Zyklon B remains unsolved, but is far more serious than Provan thinks. In fact, this is in blatant contradiction to the thesis of the transformation of crematorium II in the criminal sense – a thesis which Provan himself adheres to.

Pressac maintains that crematorium II, like crematorium III, was planned and constructed as a normal facility for hygienic and sanitary purposes,[757] but at the end of October 1942 the Central Construction Office decided to transfer the presumed homicidal gassing activity from the so-called “Bunker” to the crematoria of Birkenau. In fact, from the end of 1942 the original plans of the basement underwent various modifications, in which Pressac sees “criminal traces” of the transformation of the basement for homicidal purposes with the installation of a gas chamber in morgue 1 and of an undressing room in morgue 2. The modification Pressac emphasizes most is that in plan 2003 of December 1942: the corpse chute is not included on it. This implies, the French historian tells us, “the unique possible access to the morgue became the north stairway, which implies that the dead will have to descend the stairs on foot.”[758]

Pressac’s interpretation has been accepted in its general line of argument by all western historians who support the existence of homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz, such as Robert Jan van Pelt, who took it up in his book *Auschwitz 1270 to the Present* (written in collaboration with Debórah Dwork),[759] where he quotes, without even giving a source, the following comment of Pressac:[760]

“The victims would walk to their death.”

I have shown elsewhere, however, that the corpse chute appears on numerous panes of 1943, proving that it was *not* removed:[761]

In this context, another “criminal trace” cited by Pressac is the term “special basement.” In this regard he writes:[762]

“To inform Bischoff, Wolter wrote a note on this subject entitled ‘De-aeration for the crematoria (crematoria I and II)’ in which he designated the ‘basement 1 for corpses’ [Morgue 1] of crematorium II as a ‘special basement’ (Sonderkeller).”

This note, written on November 27, 1942, by SS-Untersturmführer Wolter, would have formed part of the presumed plan of the Central Construction Office to transfer the activity “with gas” in Bunkers 1 and 2 to a locality in the crematorium equipped with artificial ventilation and would constitute the first “criminal blunder”— that is, the first indication of “an abnormal use of the crematoria that is inexplicable except as a massive treatment of human beings with gas.”⁷⁷ Therefore, the term “special basement,” which appears in this note, would be a secret code designating a homicidal gas chamber. Pressac’s argument is based solely on the presence of this term.

Wolter, in the note under discussion and referring to what engineer Prüfer had told him on the telephone, wrote:[763]

“Within about 8 days the firm [Topf] will have a mechanic free who can install the de-aeration system when the ceilings of the special basements are ready; also the forced draft blowers for the five three-muffle ovens.”

As we have seen above according to Pressac, the term “special basement” designated “the ‘basement 1 for corpses’ of crematorium II.”

Nevertheless, in this document the term “special basements” is in the plural, and moreover the possibility that it refers also to the “basement 1 for corpses” of crematorium III can be excluded. Although this document has for its object the “de-aeration for the crematoria” [*Entlüftungen für Krematorien*] (that is, for crematoria II and III) in reality it refers only to crematorium II. In fact, it was only in crematorium II that construction work had progressed to the point that within a short period of time the roofs of the basements would be finished. Indeed, by January 23, 1943, the reinforced concrete ceilings of cellars 1 and 2 in crematorium II had already been completed, while in the corresponding localities of crematorium III only the work of isolating the floor from the water-bearing stratum (aquifer) had been finished.[764]

Furthermore, the reference to the installation of the “forced draft blowers” only makes sense with respect to crematorium II, in which the five 3-muffle ovens as well as the smoke conduits had already been completed, whereas in crematorium III the chimney had been raised up only to the crematorium ceiling.⁷⁹ On the other hand, there were two basement rooms in crematorium II for which a “de-aeration system” was foreseen, namely, morgue 1 *and* morgue 2. The first was also furnished with an aeration system, the second only with a de-aeration system, which was installed between March 15 and 21, 1943.[\[765\]](#) It is therefore clear that the “special basements” in Wolter’s note were the two morgues of crematorium II. These basements were “special” precisely because they were the only two morgues thus equipped with a “de-aeration system” among the six basements into which the basement of the crematorium was subdivided.[\[766\]](#)

The term “special basement” also appears in a document formerly unknown to Pressac. In the “Construction Report for the Month of October 1942” drawn up by Bischoff on November 4, 1942, one reads referring to crematorium II:[\[767\]](#)

“Constructing concrete pressure plate in special basement, walled up the de-aeration ducts and started the inner basement wall.”

The “concrete pressure plate” was the layer of concrete at the floor of the cellars that served to balance the groundwater pressure.[\[768\]](#)

If, as seems likely, the term “special basement” refers in this context to morgue 1, then its use is explained by the fact that this locality, being equipped with a system for both aeration and de-aeration, was probably – as Pressac himself hypothesizes – intended:[\[769\]](#)

“to take corpses several days old, beginning to decompose and thus requiring the room to be well ventilated.”

Let us suppose that Pressac’s interpretation of the criminal transformation of the crematoria is correct. Let us concede that this “special basement” was morgue 1, and that this was a secret code indicating a homicidal gas chamber.

Then let us see what the consequences of this postulation are regarding the question of the openings we are examining in the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II.

Pressac maintains that at the end of October 1942 the Central Construction Office decided to transfer the presumed homicidal gassing activity from the so-called Bunker 1 and 2 “to a locality of the crematorium equipped with artificial ventilation, as was practiced in December 1941 in the morgue of

crematorium I.”^[770] This is how he explains the way, in which the presumed homicidal gassing was carried out in this crematorium [crematorium I]:^[771]

“Three square holes were made and located in the ceiling of the ‘morgue’^[772] to allow for the introduction of Zyklon B, which was poured directly into the locality whose two access doors had been made gastight.”

As photograph 20995/506 of Auschwitz Museum demonstrates, and as Provan himself admits, the ceiling of morgue 1 of crematorium II was constructed without holes for the introduction of Zyklon B.

If then the “special basement” of crematorium II designated a homicidal gas chamber to be realized according to the model of crematorium I, why did the Central Construction Office not anticipate the holes in the reinforced concrete roof of morgue 1 during the construction of its scaffolding by carpenters?

Therefore, one must imagine that the Central Construction Office, although having planned the transformation of morgue 1 into an homicidal gas chamber at the time when only the concrete floor in this locality had been laid for protection against the water-bearing stratum, would have constructed a ceiling without holes – an essential device for gassing with Zyklon B – and then later, with hammer and chisel, made four holes for Zyklon B in the reinforced concrete roof of the locality which was 18 cm thick!

Unfortunately for Pressac, the technicians of the Central Construction Office were not that idiotic. In fact, as we shall see in chapter 2.7., at the time of laying the concrete they prepared the round hole in the reinforced concrete ceiling of morgue 2 for the passage of piping for the de-aeration system, and they did the same thing in the ceiling of the furnace room for the five intake openings for hot air.

In conclusion, not only is the postulation regarding perforations in the ceiling of morgue 1 to create holes for the introduction of Zyklon B an “inconceivably stupid error,” as Germar Rudolf says, but it is also decisively senseless and totally against one of the cornerstones of the thesis of Pressac, van Pelt and Provan himself.

2.7. Archaeological Proofs

In March of 2000 Provan went to Birkenau and made a series of

inspections of the ceiling of morgue 1 of crematorium II, which he then documented together with 18 photographs (pp. 37-41).

He mentions eight holes, three of which – numbers 2, 6 and 8 – he considers to be original (pp. 25-26 and 30), that is, chiseled in by the SS in 1943 in order to introduce Zyklon B into the “gas chamber,” so that “the ‘No Holes, No “Holocaust”’ argument is no longer possible to make, since there are three suitable areas where there are holes in the roof, in accord with eyewitness testimony, with the fourth unobservable.”(p. 31)

Let us examine his arguments.

2.7.1. Provan’s Two Assumptions

Provan’s conclusion rests on the assumption that the presumed holes for introducing Zyklon B measured 25 cm × 25 cm, according to a statement of Karl Schultze (p. 30).

Karl Schultze participated with Heinrich Messing in the installation of the “de- and aeration system” in crematorium II. His dispatch to Auschwitz for this purpose was announced in advance on February 24, 1943, by the Topf firm for the first of March.[\[773\]](#) He worked with Messing in morgue 1 until March 13th, the date on which the ventilation system was definitely put into operation.[\[774\]](#) The day after the first presumed gassing took place,[\[775\]](#) so that the columns described by Tauber had already been installed.[\[776\]](#) By contrast, Schultze mentions no columns, limiting himself to saying:[\[777\]](#)

“In the ceiling were four square openings 25 x 25 centimeters.”

Provan fails to notice this contradiction.

2.7.2. The testimony of Michał Kula

The above assumption is moreover categorically belied by the witness Michał Kula. It is necessary to specify that the existence of the holes in question is based exclusively on testimonies, and in this respect the quintessential witness is Michał Kula, inmate no. 2718. I will explain why. First let us see what he declared during his cross-examination on June 11, 1945:[\[778\]](#)

“Among other things made in the locksmith’s workshop were the fake showers intended for the gas chambers, as well as the columns of wire netting for introducing the contents of cans of Zyklon into the gas chambers. This column had a height of 3 meters with a square cross-section (width) of about 70 cm. Such a column was constituted of three

nets, one inside the other. The outside net was made of 3 mm iron wire stretched over angle irons measuring 50 mm x 10 mm. These angle irons were found all over the net and the upper and lower parts were linked by an angle iron of the same type. The mesh of the nets was square, measuring 45 mm. The second net was constructed in the same way and was inserted into the interior of the first at a distance of about 150 mm. The mesh of this net was square and measured about 25 mm. Both nets on angle irons were connected by an iron bar. The third part of the column was movable. It was an empty column made of a thin zinc lamina with a square section of about 150 mm. At the top it terminated in a cone and below in a flat square base. Angle irons of sheet metal were welded onto a thin bar of sheet metal at a distance of about 25 mm from the edge of this column. On these angle irons a thin net was stretched with square mesh of about 1 mm. This net ended at the base of the cone and from there toward the upper extension of the net ran a framework of sheet metal along the full height to the vertex of the cone. A can of Zyklon was poured from above into the distribution cone and thus a uniform distribution of the Zyklon on all four sides of the column was obtained. After evaporation of the gas the entire central column was withdrawn and the evaporated silica removed.”

Kula was a member of the “inmate locksmith shop” as a turner. His number appears in a document with a stamp dated February 8, 1943, and having for object “Inmate locksmith shop. Listing of inmates,” in which the numbers of the 192 detainees who belonged to this workshop are recorded. [779] The inmate locksmith shop was one Kommando of various work shops of the Central Construction Office specializing in various building sectors, in which the Kommandos of inmates operated, usually specialized workmen.

The Kommandos of the workshops did their work in all construction sites, including the crematoria. Following the practice of 1942, the head of construction or leader of construction, who needed the service, first submitted a request to the materials administration with the correct, numbered form. If the request was authorized, the head of workshop imparted the task to the Kommando concerned by means of the appropriate numbered form, in which the type of work to be done was indicated. The Kommando, which carried out the work, then compiled a work-card, in which the job number, the Kommando, the consignee, the commencement, and the end of the work was indicated. On the back of the card the materials used were listed and the cost

of the materials plus the work. The inmate locksmith shop had a different card, on which was recorded: the inmate detail, the object of the work, the customer, the start and end of the work, the name of the detainee, his qualification, and the time it took him to do the work. The back of the card was not different from the other card model. The Kommandos were subdivided into inmate details that operated under the responsibility of the head of the detail and of an Ober-Capo. If the service of the work was the manufacture of any object, the consignee signed a numbered receipt upon receiving said object.

On February 8, 1943, the 192 detainees of the inmate locksmith shop, who were under the authority of SS-Unterscharführer Kywitz, were subjected to the D.A.W. (Deutsche Ausrüstungswerke = German equipment works).⁹⁴ Beginning from the next day, the orders that had been placed with the workshop were noted in a register, which comprised the following headings: date of arrival of orders, serial number of D.A.W., reference, object, number of used working hours, start and end of the work. Then relative data was extracted from the work-cards. The register also contained an indication of the number and date of the orders based on appropriate forms. The Central Construction Office supplied these workshops with the necessary material and issued a delivery order in their favor. When the work was done, D.A.W. sent the Central Construction Office the relative invoice.⁶⁴

The numbered form, in which the type of work to be carried out was indicated, bore, as a rule, the plan that showed the form and size of the object to be constructed and listed the necessary materials. An example appears in order no. 67 of March 6, 1943, see Ill. no. 7 and 8.[\[780\]](#)

This order appears in the register of the inmate locksmith shop in the following terms:[\[781\]](#)

“8. March 43. no.165. POW camp. crematorium BW. 30 b and c. Object: 64 pieces stone screws made of round iron 5/8” Ø according to sketch as provided. Delivery time: urgent! Constr. Off. order. no. 67 of March 6, 43. Completed: April 2, 43.”

So if Kula really built the above contraption, then it was the object of a specific order of the Central Construction Office, in which there was a sketch indicating the structure and exact dimensions of the device's various parts, and Kula constructed it on the basis of this sketch. Having therefore studied the sketch and then having created the device, Kula was the person who best understood it and who could best describe it. Consequently, in this respect he

is the number one witness.

On the other hand, the description of the device for introducing Zyklon B that was supplied by Henryk Tauber in his deposition of May 24, 1945, agrees with that of Kula, as can be seen from the following translation made from the original text:[\[782\]](#)

“The vault of the gas chamber rested on concrete pillars along the center of its length. On the left and on the right of these pillars there were four columns. The outside part of these columns was made of grills of thick steel wire that went up to the ceiling and into the exterior. Inside^[783] this part was a second net with smaller mesh and holes, and in its interior a third [net] was planted. In this third net a box was moved by means of which, using a steel wire, the powder – from which the gas had by now evaporated – was withdrawn.”

Consequently, compared with the testimony of Kula, the testimony of Karl Schultze is totally insignificant, because – as we have seen above – he only mentions the holes but not the columns and hence did not see the columns at a time when they would necessarily have been present, or because he was a chance witness. Additionally, his testimony was made while he was in Soviet custody, where his two colleagues died, one of them during the interrogation![\[784\]](#)

In conclusion, if the columns measured 70 cm × 70 cm, the holes in the ceiling of morgue 1 of crematorium II could not have measured 25 cm × 25 cm.

The second assumption, upon which Provan bases his conclusions, is the “rule of architecture,” according to which

“when violent stress is put on a concrete structure, cracks show up passing through holes made previous to the violent force, since the holes makes the structure weaker in that location.” (p. 26)

Provan has distorted a “rule” mentioned and applied by Germar Rudolf in his analysis of the openings in question:[\[785\]](#)

“An opening pierced through the concrete in the roof of either morgue 1 (‘gas chamber’) in consideration at a later time would inevitably have had the consequence, when the building was blown up, that the breaks and fissures caused to the roof by the explosion would have run preferentially through these holes.

The reason for this is that explosions exert extraordinarily great forces, and that the formation of cracks is favored by any weakness in the

structure, since the tension peaks attain very high values in the vicinity of acute angles (notch effect, see Fig. 48). Such holes, in particular, which would already have damaged the structure of the concrete due to their incorporation following completion of the structure, represent not only points of likely fracture, but points of inevitable fracture.”

2.7.3. Provan’s Analysis of “Criminal” Hole no. 2

Provan adopts this “rule” in the following way to explain hole no. 2:

“According to the testimony of the witness Schultze, the Zyklon B holes were only some 25 cm square when he saw them (in 1943). We do not see why a small hole couldn’t be made much larger after suffering a violent shock of a massive explosion, so violent as to lift the entire southern end of the roof into the air high enough to smash a hole in the roof at Pillar 1 on the way down. If some of the holes in the nearby oven room were entirely destroyed in the explosion, we think it reasonable to suppose the cause for Hole 2 being so large now, is the same demolition work. Bear in mind that the explosions which occurred were strong enough to open holes in the ceiling where none had been before, and one will recognize the power to make a smaller hole bigger. So we posit a smaller hole originally, made larger by the explosives.” (pp. 27f.)

This hypothesis is unfounded, because it is not covered by the rule mentioned, which concerns only cracks emanating from existing weak spots, not that existing holes would be increased in their size. Provan’s hypothesis is also refuted by the facts.

The explosion in morgue 2 of crematorium II was still more violent than that in morgue 1 since it destroyed nearly all the roof of the locality, except for a small part at the east end. Now it is precisely on this part of the roof that there is a round hole through which passed the piping for the de-aeration (*Entlüftung*) of morgue 2 (see Ill. 9-11).

This hole, with a diameter of 38 cm, [\[786\]](#) has not suffered any damage from the explosion: its edges have remained intact (see Ill. 11). Especially round holes, which have been planned from the start and are reinforced, are not weak spots of the reinforced concrete, in particular because they do not have any acute angles.

Also the ventilation holes that existed in the reinforced concrete ceiling of the furnace room in crematorium III, which have been planned in from the start and whose edges were reinforced, have also remained intact or are

damaged, but in such a way that their rectangular form remains clearly recognizable. These holes measured 80 cm × 50 cm,^[787] were 5 in number, and each was placed on the ceiling above the central muffle of each crematory oven.^[788] As Pressac has noted, these are clearly visible in a photograph of crematorium II taken at the beginning of 1943.^[789] Illustrations 12 and 13 show the first two holes from the west, one intact, the other slightly damaged.

Pressac has published a photograph in which all five holes appear (Ill. 14). Starting from the hole nearest the lens (from the east), the first is damaged but recognizable as a hole. The second is indistinct since from it emerges one of the reinforced concrete pillars that supported the attic of the furnace room. The remains of a pillar also jut out from the first hole. The two holes are linked by a long crack that was evidently caused by the collapse of this part of the ceiling on these two pillars. The third hole appears to be slightly damaged; the fourth and fifth are intact.

Therefore, of five^[790] holes originally placed on two reinforced concrete roofs that were blown up by the SS and of which we have visual documentation, three remain intact, one is slightly damaged and the other has suffered more serious damage but is nonetheless easily recognizable as a hole: the rectangular squaring and the straight internal edges are still clearly visible.

It is a matter of fact that cracks, if they formed at all, would primarily run through acute angles, but that properly planned and reinforced holes have a lower tendency to form such cracks. It would be different with holes which would have been incorporated after the roof was finished, i.e., by damaging the concrete and the reinforcement structure. But even in such cases one would expect only cracks running through the acute angles of such a hole, but not with an enlargement of the entire hole. There would be no reason for that.

We can see from these considerations that Provan's "rule" was a distortion and falsification of Rudolf's statements, which are simply not applicable in the way Provan suggests.

Hence Provan's conclusion that the existing hole no. 2 in the roof of morgue 1 was enlarged from a smaller hole due to the explosion is totally untenable.

Such a conclusion is also untenable from a technical point of view. The reinforcement of the ceiling of the morgue consisted of a dense lattice of iron rods arranged in the longitudinal and transversal senses, as can be seen in a

photograph published by Pressac,[\[791\]](#) of which an enlarged section appears in Illustration 15.

The violent action caused by an explosion is due to the enormous pressure it causes. For example, TNT creates an impact force of 8,100 kg per square meter. Though huge, such a pressure cannot volatilize the thick plating of iron rods that are found inside the presumed original hole no. 2 of 25 cm × 25 cm (= 625 cm²).[\[792\]](#) Provan measured this hole to be 89 cm × 52 cm (p. 26), so about 4,630 cm². It follows that the explosion would have volatilized about 4,000 cm² of reinforced concrete and iron bars, leaving only insignificant traces. Nevertheless, all the other holes photographed by Provan – and also others not photographed – show most plainly the remains of the iron bars in the reinforcement, which therefore have not been volatilized at all.

Having established that hole no. 2 could not have been enlarged from an originally smaller one, let us now consider another essential question.

As I showed above, by far the most important witness of the presumed columns for introducing Zyklon B is Michał Kula.

He declared that such columns had a square cross-section of 70 cm × 70 cm and a height of 3 meters, so that they ran across the ceiling and protruded above it by 41 (=300-241-18) cm. In order to install such an apparatus it was necessary to make a slightly bigger hole in the reinforced concrete ceiling, let us say of 75 cm × 75 cm.

However, when I measured it in June 1990, hole no. 2 had a trapezoidal form of the longest side being 86 cm and a maximum width of 50 cm (see Ill. 16). The side opposite the longest ran obliquely for 52 cm toward the interior, ending in the shape of a tooth; it then continued parallel to the opposite longest side for a further 40 cm. A distance of 43 cm separated the tooth from the opposite side.

Between 1992 (Ill. 17) and 1997 (Ill. 18), the hole has been coarsely enlarged and squared by blows with a chisel.

As can be seen from a comparison of the Illustrations 19-21, hole no. 2 appearing in the photograph of 1945 has been successively enlarged, especially in its eastern part.

Because the longest sides of the hole measured 50 cm × 86 cm in 1991 and this hole was smaller in 1945, it could not have contained a column with square section 70 cm × 70 cm, so that this hole is absolutely incompatible with the essential testimony of Kula.

When and by whom was this hole made? Illustration 5 was taken by

Stanislaw Kolowca, who was engaged on May 29, 1945, as a press photographer by the examining magistrate Jan Sehn.[\[793\]](#) It was published as photograph no. 70 in the court record of the trial of Rudolf Höss[\[794\]](#) and probably goes back to June and July of 1945.

In the expert report on the crematoria of Auschwitz-Birkenau made by Prof. Roman Dawidowski on behalf of Jan Sehn and finished on September 26, 1946, it is stated that on the 12th of May and the 4th of June of 1945 inspections in the areas of crematorium IV and crematorium II were carried out, where there were discovered:[\[795\]](#)

“2 damaged shutters from the ventilation apertures of the gas chamber in this crematorium / zinc sieves 7 cm x 18 cm – order no. 162.”

In this regard, the expert toxicological report made by Dr. Jan Z. Robel on December 15, 1945, specifies that:[\[796\]](#)

“4 complete and 2 damaged shutters from ventilation apertures were received on May 12, 1945; these were found during inspection of crematorium II in Birkenau and originated from the ventilation apertures of the gas chamber [morgue no.1] in this crematorium.”

The inspection of this presumed gas chamber must have been very thorough, because it led to the discovery of the above six shutters.[\[797\]](#) Moreover, these were not found by accident but were searched for, because Jan Sehn knew of the ventilation system for morgue 1 either from the crematory plans later analyzed by Dawidowski or from the register of the locksmith workshop, from which could be seen that this workshop manufactured 50 shutters of this type for crematorium II.[\[798\]](#)

Nevertheless, Prof. Dawidowski did not mention any holes in the ceiling of this locality in his specialist report that listed nearly all the “criminal traces” that were later taken up by Pressac (including various photographs and eight plans of the crematoria). As for the presumed devices for the introduction of Zyklon B, he limited himself to stating:[\[799\]](#)

“Then an SS-man wearing a gas mask opened from the outside the trapdoors of the apertures in the ceiling of the gas chamber and poured the contents of cans of Zyklon B into the evaporation column of [wire] nets, which was situated beneath these holes.”

Why did Prof. Dawidowski not mention the most important evidence, that of hole no. 2 in the ceiling of morgue 1? If it existed, this hole could not have escaped the notice of Jan Sehn during his inspection of May 12, 1945. In my opinion, the hole was made during the investigation, ordered by Jan Sehn in

order to gain access to the interior of this morgue, because the entry area had collapsed. Sehn hoped to discover proof or evidence of the presumed criminal activity of the SS in this locality. However, it cannot be excluded that the Soviets had previously made it for the same purpose.

A final observation: Pressac has published a sketch of the device described by Kula in the chapter dedicated to the witness Tauber, which Provan has read with particular care and from which he has taken two citations. As Illustration 22 shows, this drawing indicates both the dimensions of the device (0.7 m × 0.7 m × 3 m) and the documentary source. [\[800\]](#)

Furthermore, the work *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, which Provan knows well since he cites it in note 35 on p. 10, has a chapter written by Franciszek Piper with the title “Gas Chambers and Crematoria,” where one reads in connection with the testimony of Michał Kula: [\[801\]](#)

“Zyklon B was distributed in the gas chamber through four introduction columns custom-made in the metalwork shops of the camp. They were shaped like pillars and made of two wire grids with a movable core. Cross sections of the pillars, 3 m high, formed a square, each measuring 70 cm.”

In spite of this, Provan never mentions it in his study. Why? And why did he fall back on the irrelevant testimony of Karl Schultze? Evidently it is because the evidence of Kula regarding measurements does not agree at all with any measurements for the holes that are found in the ceiling of morgue 1 of crematorium II today.

2.7.4. Hole No. 7

Study of hole no. 7 allows one to better understand the transformation over the years of hole no. 2. Provan accepts the revisionist argument that this hole

“cannot be a Zyklon B insertion hole, for the simple reason that up until a few years ago, the rebars originally running west to east were merely cut at the western end and pulled up and over toward the east. (This was true, though now only one of these rebars remains intact; the rest, as we have observed, have been removed). The Germans would have never constructed a poison gas aperture like this, since it could not be airtight.” (p. 26)

In fact, in 1990 this hole was as it appears in Illustration 23. From the

eastern edge of the concrete on the roof of the morgue, five iron bars of length up to 40 cm are bent back; moreover, two transverse iron bars delimit the northern and southern sides of this hole (see Ill. 24) whose edges show evident traces of chiseling.

These iron bars were still intact in 1991 (see Ill. 25) and in 1992 (see Ill. 26). In 1997 only two iron bars remained,[\[802\]](#) and the hole had been crudely squared (Ill. 27). Finally, in 2000 there remained only one single iron bar (Ill. 28).

Having established that this was not a hole for the introduction of Zyklon B and that it was not made by the SS, the question remains: who made it and why?

It is certain that this hole and also hole no. 2 were made after the collapse of the locality's roof and were later tampered with to make them look like holes for introducing Zyklon B. In order to complete this theater, a concrete cover from one of the inspection manholes for the sewer of the crematorium (Ill. 29) – that Pressac had earlier found next to this hole[\[803\]](#) – was dropped into hole no. 2.

In conclusion, if there really were four 70 cm × 70 cm square holes in the ceiling of morgue 1, what need would there have been, even for research purposes, to create new holes, even smaller ones?

2.7.5. The “Criminal” Holes No. 6 and No. 8.

Let us consider the holes regarded by Provan as “criminal.” Hole no. 6 (Ill. 30 and 31) is a crack clearly caused by the collapse of this part of the roof onto supporting pillar no. 6, exactly like hole no. 1. This does not even have a definite shape like holes no. 2 and no. 7.

Hole no. 8 (Ill. 32) forms a part of a long fracture in the roof of the morgue, due to the fact that this part of the roof separated from the exterior wall (evident in the background of Ill. 33) and collapsed onto Pillar 6 (that appears around the right of the fissure) and Pillar 5, not visible, which is found to the left, under the roof, in connection with the start of the fracture.

This fracture continues to the right of pillar 6 in a large crack in which the lattice of iron rods of the reinforcement is clearly visible (Ill. 34).

Hole no. 8, like no. 6, is a simple fracture without definite shape. Moreover, as can be seen in the enlargement in Illustration 32, a good half of its area (the upper part) is crossed by four iron bars, which confirms on the one hand that we are dealing with a fracture caused by the collapse of the

roof, and, on the other, which excludes the possibility that it was an introduction hole for Zyklon B, as Provan admits is the case for hole no. 7. In fact, accepting the revisionist thesis, he denies that this hole served for introducing Zyklon B precisely because of the previous presence on its edges of the reinforcing iron bars (p. 26).

2.7.6. The “Chimneys”

There is another important problem, to which Provan has not paid the slightest attention: the question of the little “chimneys” supposedly constructed on the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II and whose purpose was to house and protect the metallic nets for introducing Zyklon B – chimneys, which, as we have seen above, protruded by 41 cm above the level of the roof. According to Tauber, these chimneys were closed “with a concrete cover” (p. 4), so they must have been made from bricks – something otherwise obvious – and these bricks had to be held together with either cement or lime mortar. Nevertheless, inside the holes now existing in the reinforced concrete roof there is no trace of these “chimneys,” and it is impossible that the explosion, which destroyed morgue 1, caused a disappearance of all the bricks and mortar from which they were made.

2.7.7. The Hypothesis of Robert Jan van Pelt

In his report for the Irving-Lipstadt trial, van Pelt provided a peculiar argument to explain the absence of holes in the roof of morgue 1. In fact, he takes it to be “logical” that these holes for the introduction of Zyklon B were closed again by the SS before they blew the roof of the crematorium sky-high![\[804\]](#)

Therefore, the SS would have worried about the Soviets finding traces of the holes for the introduction of Zyklon B and then have left in their hands 5,800 eyewitnesses to the alleged homicidal gassing as well as the entire archives of the Central Construction Office![\[805\]](#)

And all this without taking into consideration the fact that the closure of a big hole in a roof of reinforced concrete would have left easily visible traces, as can be seen in the ceiling of the morgue of crematorium I! When at the end of 1944 this crematorium was transformed by the SS garrison physician[\[806\]](#) into a “gas tight surgery room,” round holes for the ventilation piping were made in the ceiling of the former morgue, then subdivided into small rooms. In fact, the August 26, 1944, letter of chief of air protection SS

Obersturmführer Josten mentioned:[\[807\]](#)

“Manufacture of the openings in the masonry necessary for the heating ovens, as well as for the ventilation outlets and intakes and pipes.”

But since the external wall of the morgue was covered with earth (just like the opposite wall on the side of the furnace room), it is clear that holes for the piping of the ventilation system were made through the ceiling. They were subsequently closed again, but in the ceiling of the locality there remain traces still easily recognizable, as can be seen from Illustration 35.

In morgue 1 of crematorium II, a large area of the ceiling is preserved around pillar no. 1, a zone in which the first hole for the introduction of Zyklon B should be found. Yet from the inside, the ceiling shows no sign of having been closed again, and this should have been even more evident because the ceiling still preserves the outline of planks used for the original carpentry work. Illustration 36 shows a section of the ceiling of morgue 1 (east side).

Van Pelt’s hypothesis is therefore totally untenable.

2.8. The Reliability of Witnesses Tauber and Kula

Having established that there are no introduction holes for Zyklon B in the reinforced concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II, and that there never were any, it remains to explain the concordance between the testimonies of Kula and Tauber.

It must first be established whether the devices described by the two witnesses were effectively constructed.

If Kula had really built the device he describes, then it was ordered from the inmate locksmith shop of the Central Construction Office by means of a specific order, as we have seen in chapter 2.7. But if this is true, this order ought to appear in the register of the locksmith shop.

On July 25, 1945 – some months after witnesses Tauber and Kula had been heard – the examining magistrate Jan Sehn drew up a record, in which he summarized all orders relating to the crematoria that had been found in the above register:[\[808\]](#)

“There are in the book, among other things, the following entries that refer to work done by the locksmith shop in relation to the construction and maintenance of the crematoria.”

Then follows the list of entries of the orders of the Central Construction

Office relating to the crematoria. Yet in this long list – which contains 85 orders – the device described by Kula is missing.

Because the first entry is an order slip of the Central Construction Office dated October 28, 1942,¹²³ the absence of the device described by Kula is not for chronological reasons. Its absence is neither for reasons of “secrecy,” since in the register various orders are recorded relating to gas-tight doors, [809] which are claimed to have been ordered for the alleged gas chambers in the crematoria.

On the other hand, even one piece of work carried out by Kula personally appears in the register. In fact, Jan Sehn writes at the end of his list:[810]

“Moreover, under the current number 433 of the book there is an entry dated May 20, 1943, with the following drift:

‘X-ray station women’s camp: object: 2 pieces connection pieces for rubber hose. Delivery time – urgent. Hand to Prof. Schumann. Worker: Kula. Finished: 21.5.43.’

Compare the interrogation record of witness Michał Kula dated June 11, 1945.”

Jan Sehn knew therefore perfectly well that Kula’s statements about the columns for introducing Zyklon B had no documentary basis and were therefore false. But when at the hearing of March 15, 1947, Kula testified as a witness during the Höss trial[811] and once again provided the above description of the columns,[812] nobody confronted him with the fact that the relative order did not appear in the register of the locksmith shop. And the reason for this is easy to understand.

Moreover, something even more surprising is that during his interrogation on June 11, 1945, Kula made explicit reference to the above work done for Dr. Schumann, giving the exact number of the relative order in the register of the locksmith shop:[813]

“From the book of the locksmith shop it emerges that at the time I had to repair this pump / running no. 433.”

Hence, he already knew this register, but then why did he not indicate any “running number” for the above-mentioned columns? In this case the response is also easy to comprehend.

It is finally necessary to establish if the testimonies of Kula and Tauber on this matter are independent of each other. Seeing that the descriptions of the columns given by these two witnesses coincide and that these columns were never constructed, it is clear that we are dealing with a concordance of

falsehood, so that the question of independence of the testimonies becomes irrelevant. It remains a fact, however, that Tauber and Kula remained at Birkenau until the 18th and 21st of January 1945 respectively, and, considering the close contact that detainees maintained (above all those who belonged to various resistance movements in the camp), the independence of the testimonies seems exceedingly dubious.

2.9. Conclusions

The thesis of holes for introducing Zyklon B in the reinforced concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II is based exclusively on statements made by self-styled eyewitnesses, in particular by Michał Kula, and there is neither documentary nor material proof to support it. In their turn, these statements have no verification, either documentary or material, so they are totally unreliable. In its present state, the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II shows no holes for the introduction of Zyklon B, nor is it possible that they were later closed without leaving any trace. Therefore these holes never existed. This does not justify the slogan “No Holes? No Holocaust,” but fully justifies the following conclusion:

No holes, no homicidal gas chamber in crematorium II.



*No homicidal gas chamber in crematorium II,
no homicidal gas chamber at Auschwitz.*

No Holes, No Gas Chambers!

2.10. Documents and Photographs



Ill. 1: Photograph of crematorium II in Birkenau (neg. no. 20995/507, Auschwitz Museum)



Ill. 3: Drawing of the southern façade of crematorium II (plan 1173-1174(r)).

Ill. 2: Position and field of view of photographer of photo of crematorium II in Birkenau, May 31, 1944.



III. 4: *Allied air photo of crematorium II in Birkenau, May 31, 1944.*



Ill. 5: The reinforced concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau in June/July 1945. Photo by Stanislaw Kolowca.



III. 6: *The reinforced concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau in August 2000. © Carlo Mattogno*

1160

Rüppert, den 6. 3. 1943

Zentral-Bauleitung
der Waffen- und Polizei
Aufschw. O/S
ARCHIVUM

Zentral-Bauleitung
der Waffen- u. Polizei
Aufschw. O/S.

Nr. 0462
67

Auftrag von


für *Stückzahl Ausreifungswerke Rüppert*
Schlosserei

Bedingungen:


Lieferzeit: *Bill!* **Dringend**

Betreff: *H. G. F. B. W. 30 b. u. c - Einsparungsanlage*

64 Stück *Neupfannen aus Rüppert 5/8"*
nach Maßstab des Kizps



500 mm 32 Hück.



250 mm 32 Hück.

Lieferung erfolgt frei Haus. Maße sind an der Baustelle selbst nachzuprüfen.
Genauer Materialbedarf (einzeln spezifiziert) ist sofort auf der Zeichnung mitzuteilen.

Schimmelpf
22.4.

Wiese

(328)

III. 7: Order of Central Construction Office to inmate locksmith shop, no. 67 of March 6, 1943.

67.

ARCHIVUM

Ungeprüft

D.A.W. W.L. Schlosserei Kutschwitz, den 8. 1. 1943

Betrifft: K.G.L. Einscherenanlage, Bm 30 b

Lauf. Nr. 1160

Baufig. Nr. 67

Material-Anforderung

Für

St. Steinschrauben und Rundstange

wird benötigt

10 m Rundstange 8 16 m/m
für 64 St. Muttern 5/8 oder
15 m Sechskantstange 27 m/m Seil

Eingetragen

2221

Erledigt am: 8. 2. 1943

Handwritten signature

Handwritten signature: Rühn 44 Unha

222a

III. 8: Back side of the same document.



Ill. 9:
*Round
opening for
the pipe of
the
ventilation
through the
reinforced
concrete
roof of
morgue 2 of
crematorium
II in
Birkenau.
August
2000. © Carlo
Mattogno.*

--	--



Ill. 10: Round opening for the pipe of the ventilation through the reinforced concrete roof of morgue 2 of crematorium II in Birkenau. Section enlargement of Ill. 9. © Carlo Mattogno




Ill. 11: Round opening for the pipe of the ventilation through the reinforced concrete roof of morgue 2 of crematorium II in Birkenau. October 1991. © Carlo Mattogno






III. 13:
*Ceiling of
 the oven
 room of
 crematorium
 III. Second
 ventilation
 opening
 (seen from
 the west).
 June 1990.*
 © Carlo
 Mattogno



III. 12:
*Ceiling of
 the oven
 room of
 crematorium
 III. First
 ventilation
 opening
 (seen from
 the west).
 June 1990.*
 © Carlo
 Mattogno



III. 14: All five ventilation openings of the ceiling of the oven room of crematorium III. Photo by J.-C. Pressac.



III. 15: Part of the reinforcement bars of the concrete roof of underground morgue 2 of crematorium II during construction.
Photo published by J.-C. Pressac.



III. 16: Concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau.
Provan's opening 2 in June 1990. © Carlo Mattogno



Ill. 17: Concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau.
Provan's opening 2 in July 1992. © Carlo Mattogno



III. 18: *Concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau.
Provan's opening 2 in August 1997. © Carlo Mattogno*




Ill. 19: Concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II. Provan's opening 2 in June-July 1945. Section enlargement of photo 5.




Ill. 20: Concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau. Provan's opening 2 in July 1992. © Carlo Mattogno





Ill. 21:
Concrete
roof of
morgue 1 of
crematorium
II in
Birkenau.
Provan's
opening 2 in
August
2000. © Carlo
Mattogno



Document 14:

SCHEMATIC DIAGRAM OF A ZYKLON-B INTRODUCTION COLUMN

Based on the deposition of 11th June 1945 made by Michal KULA, former prisoner 2718 who worked in the metal working shop where these columns were made.

Ill. 22: Drawing of Zyklon B introduction device by J.-C. Pressac, following the description of M. Kula.



III. 23: Concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau. Provan's opening 7 in June 1990. © Carlo Mattogno



III. 24: Concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau. Reinforcement bars of Provan's opening 7 in June 1990. © Carlo Mattogno



Ill. 25: Concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau. Provan's opening 7 in October 1991. © Carlo Mattogno



Ill. 26: Concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau. Provan's opening 7 in July 1992. © Carlo Mattogno



III. 27: Concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau.
Provan's opening 7 in August 1997. © Carlo Mattogno



III. 28: Concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau.
Provan's opening 7 in August 2000. © Carlo Mattogno



III. 29: Concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau. Provan's opening 2 in October 1991. Inside the morgue on the floor a square concrete lid can be seen stemming from the sewer manhole of this crematorium. © Carlo Mattogno




III. 30: Concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau. Provan's opening no. 6 in June 1990. © Carlo Mattogno



Ill. 31:
*Concrete
roof of
morgue 1 of
crematorium
II in
Birkenau.
Provan's
opening no.
6 in August
2000. © Carlo
Mattogno*



*III. 32: Concrete roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in Birkenau.
Provan's opening no. 8 in August 2000. © Carlo Mattogno*






Ill. 33:
Concrete
roof of
morgue 1 of
crematorium
II in August
2000. Line
of the crack,
to which
Provan's
opening no.
8 belongs –
to the right
of this photo
(see photo
34). © Carlo
Mattogno



Ill. 34:
Concrete
roof of
morgue 1 of
crematorium
II in
Birkenau in
August
2000.
Provan's
opening 8
(in the
center) and
continuation
of crack
(see photo
33), of
which
opening 8 is
a part. ©
Carlo Mattogno



III. 35: *Ceiling of the morgue of crematorium I, August 1997. The traces of a circular opening for the ventilation of the air-raid shelter. © Carlo Mattogno*



III. 36: *Inside of morgue 1 of crematorium II, July 1992. © Carlo Mattogno*

3. Detailed Study of Crematorium I

3.1. Transformations of Crematorium I (1944 – 1947)

During a visit to Auschwitz on July 16, 1944, SS-*Obergruppenführer* Pohl approved the “Installation of a gas-tight surgery and fragment-proof shelter in the former crematorium for the garrison surgeon,”[\[814\]](#) which became work-site BW 98M.

On August 26, 1944, SS *Obersturmführer* Heinrich Josten who held the post of “chief air-raid warden” wrote to the camp commander a letter on the subject of “modification of the old crematorium for air-raid protection purposes.”[\[815\]](#) This project, entitled “Modification of old crematorium. Air-raid shelter for SS sick-bay with a surgery” (Plan no. 4287) was drawn up on September 21, 1944.[\[816\]](#)

On October 17, 1944, SS *Sturmbannführer* Karl Bischoff, Head of Waffen-SS and Police Building Inspectorate “Silesia,” wrote a letter to the Central Construction Office requesting that the work, “on account of the urgency,” be undertaken immediately without going through the usual bureaucratic formalities.[\[817\]](#)

On November 2, 1944, SS *Obersturmführer* Werner Jothann, head of Central Construction Office, drew up an “Explanatory note re: transformation of the old crematorium into an air-raid shelter with surgery for SS sick-bay at concentration camp Auschwitz O/S. BW 98M.”[\[818\]](#)

The same day, he also compiled a “cost estimate for the transformation of the old crematorium into an air-raid shelter with surgery for SS sick-bay at concentration camp Auschwitz O/S. BW 98M,” arriving at a total amount of 4,300 RM,[\[819\]](#) and drew a “Location sketch construction of an air-raid shelter for SS sick-bay.”[\[820\]](#) The work was completed during the second half of November.

Plan no. 1241 of April 10, 1942, tells us that crematorium I had a morgue measuring 17 by 4.60 m, connected to a “washing room” of 4.17 by 4.60 m, and a “room for laying-out of corpses” of 4.10 by 4.60 meters.[\[821\]](#)

This morgue, according to the official historiography, had been transformed into a homicidal gassing chamber as early as September 1941 by equipping it with two gas-tight doors and by opening up in the flat roof an

undetermined number of holes for the introduction of Zyklon B. These openings, in fact, numbered two according to Stanisław Jankowski[822] and Hans Stark,[823] six according to Pery Broad[824] and Filip Müller.[825] For his part, Rudolf Höss, in the session of March 12, 1947, of his trial, speaks of only one such opening:[826]

“The gassing occurred in this way: a hole was opened in the ceiling, and through this opening the gas was dropped in – a crystalline mass.”

Finally, the alleged workman for the openings – the detainee Czesław Sułkowski – who should have been the person best informed about their number, size, shape, and position, actually knew nothing in this respect. In his declaration of September 28, 1971, he, in fact, limited himself to an evasive statement, saying:[827]

“We had first set up an oven in the crematorium. I myself did the openings in the ceiling of the morgue where the first Soviet POWs were gassed. I saw these Russians when they were taken [there]. They stood in the street near the block leader’s room between the present hotel and the crematorium, hundreds of them, naked, waiting to be gassed. I saw SS [men] dropping the gas through the openings into the morgue.”

The transformation of the crematorium into an air-raid shelter, on the basis of plan no. 4287 of September 21, 1944 (see Ill. 2), was done by splitting the morgue into four rooms by means of three partitions. In the first room, on the south side, which functioned as an airlock, an entrance from the outside was opened up and a small vestibule was installed measuring two by two meters. Furthermore, the “vestibule,” which lay behind the main entrance to the crematorium, was closed by means of a partition and the other walls were reinforced, resulting in another airlock of 3.87 by 3.45 meters.

According to the letter from Josten already mentioned, “7 pcs. doors gas-tight and fragment-proof”[828] had been planned, but Jothann’s estimate of November 2, 1944, mentions “6 pcs. simple interior doors.”[829] Actually, for reasons of economy, the camp administration had apparently only three “gas- and fragment-proof” doors installed – those of the two airlocks (still existing) and the one of the access to the oven room, which leaned against a wall of the room oven until 1993. It had probably been removed by the Germans themselves when they changed the layout of the air-raid shelter at some point in 1944 by walling up the door leading into the former oven room. The six partitions were equipped with ordinary doors and the two small cabinets of the toilet received two doors measuring 70 by 200 cm according

to the plan no. 4287 and Josten's letter of August 26, 1944: "2 pcs. doors single 70 by 200 cm." [830]

But then what happened to the two alleged gas-tight doors of the alleged homicidal gas chamber? One of them – the one which separated the morgue from the furnace hall – is said to have been dismantled and temporarily replaced by a standard gas-tight air-raid shelter door like the two outer doors. [831] The other, which separated the washing room from the laying-out room, is said to have been removed and replaced with an ordinary door [832] – and all this in a gas-tight air-raid shelter, in which every single door had to be "gas- and fragment-proof"!

Needless to say, at the liberation of the camp not the slightest trace was found of the two gas-tight doors of the alleged homicidal gas chamber, and no trace of them exists in the documentation of the Central Construction Office.

Between 1946 and 1947, the Poles, in an effort to reconstitute the "original state" of the alleged homicidal gas chamber, demolished not only the three partitions mentioned above, but also the one, which separated the morgue from the washing room. In the space thus obtained, they created four openings in the roof – the alleged openings for the introduction of Zyklon B – into which they inserted small wooden casings with lids (see Ill. 11-13). Today, the alleged gas chamber of crematorium I is, therefore, 21.32 m long, i.e. 4.32 m longer than the original room. The Poles also created an opening in the wall linking the morgue with the furnace room (which had been walled up by the SS at some point in 1944), but moved it half a meter out of the original position of the door and gave it a rather crude shape.

3.2. The Alleged Openings for Introducing Zyklon B

3.2.1. Jean-Claude Pressac's Interpretation

In 1989, J.-C. Pressac published one photograph from a series taken by Stanisław Luczko, [833] probably in May 1945 (see Ill. 6). It shows the flat roof of crematorium I. The French historian gave it the title "Dance on the roof of the old crematorium" and commented as follows: [834]

*"View of the roof of Krematorium I, looking south-north, 1945 (May?). The chimney has not yet been rebuilt. The features of the roof are:
– two ventilation chimneys for the furnace room (two-tone with a dark cap)*

- two other brick chimneys, probably for ventilating the air-raid shelter in view of their newly-built appearance
- in addition, on a line parallel to – and to the left of – that on which the two brick chimneys are built, it is possible to see *THREE* places where the former traps for introducing Zyklon-B have been filled, thus indicating that the morgue had been used as a gas chamber.

Above the stage, dominated by a red star with the hammer and sickle, fly the flags of Poland (left) and the Soviet Union (right), with lamps mounted above them.

This photograph proves that a dance was organized in 1945 on the roof of Krematorium I, and that people actually danced above the homicidal gas chamber. This episode appears almost unbelievable and sadly regrettable, and the motives for it are not known. This photo also proves that the present covering of roofing felt and the zinc surround of the roof are not original.”

Hence, Pressac undertakes to demonstrate the 1941 creation of three openings in the ceiling of the morgue on the basis of a photograph taken in 1945. Let us look into this question more closely.

The ex-detainee Adam Żłobnicki made the following declaration in a statement given on November 18, 1981:[\[835\]](#)

“I remember perfectly well that the openings for the introduction of Zyklon B, which were located on the flat roof of this crematorium, were also remade.^{[\[836\]](#)} The reconstruction was made easier by the fact that at the locations of the former insertion openings there remained clear traces after the sealing of the former openings with cement. At these very points, the openings were re-established and the little chimneys^{[\[837\]](#)} were raised. This work, too, was done in 1946 – 1947.”

The four shafts constructed by the Poles after the war are located as indicated in document 5. They consist of two parallel pairs along the internal (A-B) and the external (C-D) wall of the morgue. The shafts C and D are 82 cm away from the external wall, shaft A is 90 cm, and shaft B 85 cm away from the internal wall. Hence, the shafts are the corners of an irregular parallelogram with a height of 2.40 m.

What is interesting here is that in the present state of the room shaft D is 5.10 m from the wall with the door to the outside; shaft C is 7.10 m away from the opposite wall, which separated the washing room from the laying-out room; shaft B is 7.10 m away from the wall of the little vestibule near the

entrance; and shaft A is 5.10 m from the opposite wall.

Such an arrangement makes sense only in relation to the *present* state of the morgue. It is, in fact, clear that the position of the shafts was based on their distance from the short, transverse walls of the present hall, by rationally subdividing the available length of 21.3 meters: The shafts A and D are 5.10 m, the shafts B and C 7.10 m away from the wall. Oddly enough, the respective distance of shaft B was apparently not measured from the outer wall, but from the wall separating the vestibule. As a result, shaft B was shifted 2 m against shaft D. But at the time when the alleged original shafts are said to have been broken through the ceiling of the morgue, the wall forming the vestibule did not exist, whereas a wall separating the washing room from the morgue was still in place. This means that the locations of today's shafts make sense only when considering the current layout of this room of crematorium I. Hence, these shafts have no relation to the original state of this room.

Considering the *original* structure of the morgue (see Ill. 3), such an arrangement of the shafts is altogether senseless because shaft D would still be at 5.10 m from the wall, but shaft B would be 9.1 m away from it, while shaft A would be only 0.7 m away from the partition towards the washing room, and shaft C some 2.8 m from it.

The irrationality of such an arrangement becomes all the more apparent if we consider that, as a result, the rear half of the morgue, adjoining the washing room, with its surface area of (8.5 m × 4.60 m =) 39.1 m² would have been equipped with three shafts (A, B, C), whereas the other half of equal dimensions would have had only one (D)!

Let us now look at the 1945 from published by Pressac. The three dark spots (designated 1, 2, and 3 in Ill. 6) are aligned parallel to the two brick ventilation chimneys, of which the first one (the one closest to the camera) is located on top of the morgue. Furthermore, the first dark spot appears to the right of the first chimney (S2 in Ill. 4 and 5), whereas in the reconstruction by the Auschwitz Museum the alleged opening for the introduction of Zyklon B closest to this ventilation chimney (point "B," see Ill. 3-5) is to its left. If these dark spots were the traces of the alleged Zyklon B introduction openings and if, as the witness Żłobnicki tells us, the present openings were created at the same locations where traces of the original openings appeared, why was no opening made at the point where dark spot no. 1 can be seen? Inversely, the Auschwitz Museum had an opening made (point "C" in Ill. 3-

5) at a point where the photograph in question shows no dark spot.

When the crematorium was transformed into an air-raid shelter for the SS sick-bay, the work sheet specified, i.a., “creation of ducts and wall openings for the heating ovens and the intake and outlet of the ventilation system” and, more specifically, “5 pcs. wall openings for devices.”[\[838\]](#)

Today the walls surrounding the morgue show no traces of openings. What is more, the outside wall was and still is covered by an earth embankment, as is the rear wall as well, with the exception of the narrow passage through this embankment leading to the entrance door. On the other hand, the front wall is completely bare and has only one window on the side of the morgue. Finally the wall between the morgue and the furnace hall shows no traces of openings either, and it would have made no sense, anyway, to pierce it for the installation of stovepipes or ventilators.

Thus it is clear that the five openings mentioned above were created in the ceiling of the rooms that had been turned into an air-raid shelter.

In the ceiling of the morgue, in its present state, there are two rectangular ventilation shafts, one in a corner of the former laying-out room (the later surgery room, marked as S1 in Ill. 4 and 5), the other in a corner of the second air-raid shelter room seen from the entrance (S2). Due to their location right at the wall, it is generally assumed that these shafts were added during the transformation of the building into an air-raid shelter.

In addition to these two shafts, one can still distinguish the traces of four *circular* openings that have been crudely walled up.[\[839\]](#) They originally had a diameter of about 35 cm. The corresponding traces are situated (as measured from their centers) at 1 m, 7.2 m, 8.5, and 18.30 m from the rear wall of the morgue (where the entrance is today), and at distances of 1.0 m and 1.4 m from the wall between the morgue and the furnace hall (see Ill. 3-5, 7-10).

Because the morgue was 17 m long, the fourth opening is located in the ceiling of the room, in which the corpses were washed in 1942 (the washing room). That is the first proof that those openings had nothing to do with the alleged Zyklon B introduction devices. The second proof is their shape – circular instead of square.

We therefore have six original openings in the ceiling of the rooms under investigation, four of which have been walled up at some point. The document mentioned above, however, refers only to five openings to be added.

From other documents it can be deduced that there must have been a ventilation opening in the ceiling of the morgue, when it was actually used to store corpses.[\[840\]](#) It can be assumed that opening no. 1 was this ventilation opening, first of all because intelligent design suggests putting a ventilation opening at one end of a long room, and second because the area around opening 1 turned into a vestibule on the building's transformation into an air-raid shelter, for which a ventilation opening was not required.

3.2.2. The Interpretation by the Holocaust History Project

Of late, three members of the Internet-based Holocaust History Project – Daniel Keren, Jamie McCarthy, and Harry W. Mazal – have considered the photograph published by Pressac with the aim to “correct some common misconceptions about the crematorium I gas chamber, specifically about the location of the Zyklon holes.”[\[841\]](#)

Even these authors rule out the possibility that the traces of the openings 3 and 4 correspond to the rectangular shaped spots visible on the above mentioned post-war photo as published by J.-C. Pressac, because they have a circular shape:[\[842\]](#)

“At two other locations holes were sealed, but these were circular ventilation openings.”

The authors affirm that there were originally five holes for the introduction of the Zyklon B in the roof of the crematorium, a figure which is at odds with all the testimonies. On the photograph in question, they identified the traces of a fourth dark spot in the roofing felt on the roof of the crematorium (see document 6, spot no. 4.), which had obviously escaped J.-C. Pressac's attention. They then state that four of the alleged five holes for the introduction of Zyklon B, which the Poles had created in the post-war years, were sunk exactly where the aforementioned dark spots were located, and labeled them Z3 [= 3 in my document 6], Z2 [= 2] and Z4 [= 4]; dark spot Z1 [= 1] was not reopened, according to the authors, whereas dark spot Z5, which they place between Z3 and Z2, does, in fact, not appear on the photograph.

The authors claim to have identified the traces of an alleged opening Z1 on the ceiling of the morgue, and provide a photograph of it.[\[843\]](#) It is what remains of the opening which I called no. 2. However, it was not square – as the authors affirm – but round and was not located at the site of Z1 but some 2 m away from it toward shaft B (see Ill. 3-5, 8).

Dark spot Z1 was located practically on the perpendicular of dark spot Z4, as results from the extension of the respective sides (see document 6), and was thus on the prolongation of the axis A-B in front of the present opening D (see docs. 3-5). In this area there is no trace of a walled-up opening in the ceiling of the morgue.

Hence, no opening in the roof of the morgue – current or former – corresponds to dark spot Z1. But then, why should dark spots Z2, Z3, and Z4 correspond to such openings? As a matter of fact, spot Z2 is too far away from ventilation shaft S2 to be identical with today's shaft "B," and spot Z3 is too close to ventilation shaft S1 – probably located over the washing room – to be identical with today's shaft "A." Spot Z4, on the other hand, appears to be too far away from the wall to be identical with today's shaft "D," which is only 82 cm away from the wall.

The authors claim that, when the crematorium was converted into an air-raid shelter, the alleged Zyklon B introduction openings were sealed again, [844] but this assertion, which they owe to Franciszek Piper, [845] has no documentary basis and is disproved by the cost estimate of November 2, 1944, mentioned above, which not only does not mention any kind of closing up of holes, but specifies the creation of five openings in walls, i.e. in the ceiling, as I have pointed out above. If there would have been holes already in the roof, the SS would have used those instead of weakening the roof even further by adding more holes.

The authors furthermore speak of the chemical proof:³¹

"As at the other gassing installations in the camp, cyanide compounds can still be detected in the chamber's walls, as forensic examinations by the Cracow Institute for Forensic Research demonstrate."

They refer here to the article by Jan Markiewicz, Wojciech Gubała, and Jerzy Łabędź. [846] Of the seven brickwork samples taken in the alleged gas chamber (numbers 16 – 22), three gave negative results (samples 18, 19 and 21) and the others showed a maximum content of 292 micrograms (0.292 milligrams) of cyanides per kilogram of material. [847]

Leaving aside the strange decision by the Polish scientists to drop the Iron Blue (or Prussian Blue) from the cyanide compounds to be detected by chemical analysis (which explains the extremely low values they found compared to the samples taken by Germar Rudolf and Fred Leuchter), [848] another point on which the Polish chemists can be taken to task is that they did not indicate exactly from where they took their samples.

Fred Leuchter has done this. The plan of crematorium I in appendix III of his report[\[849\]](#) shows the locations in the present morgue from which he took his 7 samples. One of them, sample no. 28, contained 1.3 milligrams (1,300 micrograms) per kilogram of substance, a value of the same order of magnitude as the other samples, except for one of them.[\[850\]](#) As opposed, however, to those samples, which were taken in the space that originally belonged to the morgue, sample no. 28 – as has already been pointed out by Enrique Aynat[\[851\]](#) – was taken by Leuchter from the wall separating the washing room from the laying-out room, which was not part of the original morgue and thus not part of the alleged gas chamber.

Therefore, the presence of cyanides in sample no. 28 cannot be explained by homicidal gassings, but only by normal disinfestations (or by analytical uncertainties or variations[\[852\]](#)). This raises, of course, the question, what evidentiary value similar cyanide residues can have in the first place.

3.3. Conclusion

The four openings now in the roof of the morgue are not original, and the dark spots, which appear on the photograph published by J.-C. Pressac, were not traces of openings (as borne out by the fact that no trace of a square opening on the ceiling corresponds to any of these dark spots).

Furthermore, sealing any openings in the roof of the crematorium would hardly have left depressions of such clarity. Leveling of the surface of an opening that has been filled with sand mortar and cement needs only a simple wooden board larger than the hole itself; but if one had wanted to create such depressions, it would have been necessary to painstakingly scratch out the cement from the surface of the hole filled with mortar. It would have amounted to a form of sabotage on the part of the bricklayer Kommando to leave such obvious traces of the alleged openings. No detainee would have risked that because on the inside, on the ceiling of the morgue, obvious traces of the closure of the holes would have remained apparent anyway.

The detainees of the roofing detail would have had to perform a similar kind of sabotage by shaping the roofing felt to fit exactly the profile of the alleged quadrangular depressions in the cement.


The explanation of the dark spots is much simpler: they were caused by compression of the roofing felt, which had become soft from sunlight, under the weight of a flat and heavy object such as a cement vase or other

decoration from the Soviet-Polish dance frolic – and that explains why the fold in the roofing felt is so marked along the edges instead of being slightly concave.


3.4. Summary


1. There is no proof that the alleged openings for the introduction of Zyklon B ever existed in the ceiling of the morgue of crematorium I.
2. There is no proof that the morgue was ever equipped with two gas-tight doors.
3. In contradiction with any kind of logical planning, these alleged gas-tight doors are said to have been later removed by the SS when the crematorium was converted to a gas-tight air-raid shelter and replaced by one normal door and one standard gas-tight door (such as it currently exists in the crematory).
4. The traces of cyanides present in the walls of the morgue do not prove that the room was used as a homicidal gas chamber.
5. The number of openings made by the Poles after the war (four) is at variance with all available testimonies. This also goes for the number (five) adopted by the members of the Holocaust History Project.
6. The Polish “reconstruction” of both the location of the openings and the structure and dimensions of the Zyklon B introduction shafts has neither basis in documents nor in witness statements. In fact there are no documents, and no witness has furnished any information on these.
7. There is no proof that the four dark spots visible on the roof of crematorium I in the photograph published by Pressac are traces of former openings that were later sealed; on the contrary, no trace on the ceiling of the morgue corresponds to any of these dark spots.
8. The remaining traces of former openings in the ceiling are circular and are no doubt connected to the transformation of the crematorium into an air-raid shelter.
9. The openings created by the Poles make sense, geometrically speaking, only in the context of the present state of the morgue, but are totally asymmetric and irrational when seen in the context of its original state. This is further proof that they have nothing whatsoever to do with any alleged original openings.


3.5. Documents and Photos




III. 1:
Inventory
plan of
building no.
47a. B.W. 11.
Crematorium.
Plan no.
1241 of April
10, 1942.
RGVA, 502-
2-146, p. 21.
This shows
the building
at a time
while it was
allegedly
used for
homicidal
gassings.
Note: The
door from the
morgue
("gas
chamber") to
the furnace
room swings
through to
both sides –
it could not
have served
as a gas
chamber
door, as such
a door could
neither be
made gas-
tight nor
panic-proof!









III. 3: Drawing of the morgue of crematorium I with rooms to the left (original state). A, B, C, D: position of current openings in the roof. 1, 2, 3, 4: position of original circular openings, today closed. T: original door to the furnace room; T1: current opening to the furnace room; T2: Current access door from the outside; S: Current vestibule, included when converted into an air-raid shelter. © Carlo Mattogno.



III. 4: Drawing of the morgue with rooms to the left after conversion to air-raid shelter. A, B, C, D: position of current openings in the roof. 1, 2, 3, 4: position of original circular openings, today closed. T: original door to the furnace room. T1: current door (both were closed during the use of this facility as an air-raid shelter). S1, S2: position of air-raid shelter's ventilation shafts. © Carlo Mattogno.



III. 5: Drawing of the morgue with room to the left, current situation. A, B, C, D: position of current openings in the roof. 1, 2, 3, 4: position of original circular openings, today closed. T: original door to the furnace room. T1: current door. S1, S2: position of ventilation shafts. © Carlo Mattogno.




Ill. 6: The roof of crematorium I, photo taken by Stanisław Luczko (probably in May 1945).²¹ 1,2,3,4: dark spots on the roof felt. The added line links the left-hand sides of spots no. 1 and 4. © Carlo Mattogno.



Ill. 7: Photo of opening no. 1 in the roof of the vestibule, part of the former morgue. © Carlo Mattogno.



III. 8: *Photo of opening no. 2 in the roof of the morgue. © Carlo Mattogno.*



III. 9: *Photo of opening no. 3 in the roof of the morgue. © Carlo Mattogno.*



III. 10: *Photo of opening no. 4 in the roof of the.* © Carlo Mattogno.



III. 11: *Photo of the roof of the morgue. All four shafts constructed by the Poles after the war.* © Carlo Mattogno.



III. 12: *Photo of the roof of the morgue. One of the four shafts constructed by the Poles after the war. © Carlo Mattogno.*



III. 13: *Photo of the ceiling of the morgue. One of the four shafts constructed by the Poles after the war. © Carlo Mattogno.*

4. Detailed Study of Crematorium II

4.1. Introduction

In the spring of 2004, Daniel Keren, Jamie McCarthy, and Harry W. Mazal published, as part of the Holocaust History Project, an article entitled “The Ruins of the Gas Chambers: A Forensic Investigation of Crematoriums at Auschwitz I and Auschwitz-Birkenau.”[\[853\]](#) In that study, the authors deal with the alleged openings for the insertion of Zyklon B on the roof slab of underground morgue 1 of crematorium II at Birkenau and of the morgue of crematorium I at Auschwitz. To the second part of their “forensic investigation” on crematorium I of the main camp I have dedicated the previous chapter 3 in this volume, in which I have demonstrated that the claims of the authors are completely inconsistent.

In the present article, I shall examine the thesis brought forward by the authors regarding morgue 1 of crematorium II.

Before we go into the matter itself, it must be stated that the authors have not mentioned, even in passing, my article “No Holes, No Gas Chamber,”[\[854\]](#) which is the most detailed revisionist study of this topic to date. They have preferred to bypass my evidence and my arguments which, therefore, retain their full demonstrative force.

Obviously, the authors’ decision to remain quiet about my article is a conscious and easily understandable move, just as their decision to remain quiet about Charles D. Provan’s text “*No Holes? No Holocaust?*”[\[855\]](#) – which is still the most serious treatment of this question on the Holocaust side – although in this case their motivation was different: they wanted to take advantage of Provan’s observations convenient to their thesis and at the same time shun his criticisms of the official thesis.

Actually, while the authors add no new element of proof to Provan’s study, they take over his argumentative structure in terms of testimonies, and terrestrial and air photos (Provan’s pp. 3-5).

4.2. A Deceptive Method

The authors’ method is simplistic and deceptive: they start from the

supposedly accepted fact that on the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II at Birkenau there had existed four openings (with external protective chimneys and internal devices for the introduction of Zyklon B) and then claim to identify them on photographs and in the ruins of the building.

Deviating from Provan, the authors neither present nor analyze all the testimonies available in this regard, but base themselves almost exclusively on Henryk Tauber's deposition of May 24, 1945, which, moreover, they know only through Pressac^[856] and without quoting even a single line from it! The fact that they do not mention the most prominent witness on the question of the Zyklon B introduction devices either – Michał Kula – is not really surprising. His testimony is too much at variance with their alleged "findings," and so they just ignore him!

Let us analyze, first of all, Tauber's deposition:^[857]

"The vault of the gas chamber rested on concrete pillars which were arranged lengthwise in the center. There were four columns right and left of these pillars. The outer part of these columns was made of a grid of thick wire which extended to the ceiling and to the outside. Within^[858] this part there was a second netting with smaller mesh and openings and on the inside of this a third, dense, netting. In this third netting a can moved by means of a wire, with which the powder was extracted from which the gas had now evaporated."

However, when he was first interrogated by the Soviets on February 27-28, 1945, Tauber had declared:^[859]

"The Zyklon gas diffused into the [gas] chamber through mesh columns which had a rectangular cross-section with walls of a double grid."

Therefore, the alleged device was not yet constituted by a triple mesh, but a double one, and did not yet have a square cross-section, but a rectangular one.

The strength of the authors' historical acumen and of their quest for the truth can be judged by their reference to another witness, Shaul Chazan (or Chasan):

"Were the wire mesh Zyklon insertion devices attached to the concrete support pillars? This hypothesis might appear reasonable, but we have found little support for it and strong evidence against it. Mr. Gideon Greif of Yad Vashem, an expert on the Auschwitz-Birkenau Sonderkommando, contacted at our request two Sonderkommando survivors who worked in

Crematoriums II and III. Mr. Shaul Chazan and Mr. Lemke Phlishko both stated that the devices were not attached to the support columns.” (p. 72)

In the book of this alleged “expert on the Auschwitz-Birkenau Sonderkommando”[\[860\]](#) there is also Shaul Chazan’s testimony. The dialog on the alleged Zyklon B introduction devices runs as follows:[\[861\]](#)

“[Greif] You said that the gas was poured in through openings in the ceiling. Did it drop to the floor or on the heads of the people?

[Chazan] No, no, no: there were several openings there. From each opening a round grid column came down. The grid was made of metal, full of holes, from the window in the ceiling down to the floor, and the poison gas was dropped through this hollow pillar, in the form of little pebbles. Then the smell would spread, that was the gas.

[Greif] Did the grid column through which the gas was dropped reach all the way down to the floor?

[Chazan] Nearly to the floor. One had left a space which made it possible to clean there. One poured water out and brushed up the remaining pebbles.” (My emphases)

So this “eyewitness,” who did not even know the number of alleged openings, speaks of a device with a circular cross-section, not a rectangular one, of perforated metal instead of wire mesh, and without a movable core for the recovery of the inert residue of the Zyklon B, because in his device, the grains of gypsum fell through the metal tube directly to the floor and were removed from below rather than from above. As anyone can see, this is a testimony in perfect “convergence” with Tauber’s.

Apart from that, a pillar that did not reach the floor had to be fastened to the concrete pillars, because otherwise it would have been demolished by the hypothetical, panicking victims. Thus, if Gideon Greif did indeed get a testimony from Shaul Chazan recently about the question of how those wire mesh columns were fastened, this can only have been a directed answer agreed upon in advance. And by the way, who could seriously claim to remember more than 60 years later such minute details as the way certain equipment in a certain room was fastened?

I have stressed in chapter 2 that the “eye witness” Miklos Nyiszli, as early as 1946, had anticipated this version when he spoke of[\[862\]](#)

“square sheet-iron pipes, the sides of which contained numerous perforations, like a wire lattice.”

4.3. The Problem

The question of the openings in the roof slab of morgue 1 in crematorium II at Birkenau has three interdependent aspects, which are related to the alleged devices for the introduction of Zyklon B:

- 1) the brick chimneys with cement covers
- 2) the openings as such
- 3) the wire-mesh devices

The authors concentrate on the first two points, leaving completely aside the third, for which no material or documentary evidence has been found. While they do claim that in the context of the transfer agreement for crematorium II (March 31, 1943) the four “*Drahtnetzeinschubvorrichtung[en]*” (wire mesh push-in devices)[\[863\]](#) listed in the inventory of the basement constitute the “inner core” of the alleged devices (p. 69), they forget, however, that in this document[\[864\]](#) these parts are attributed to morgue 2[\[865\]](#) and not to morgue 1 (the alleged homicidal gas chamber) and that they are accompanied by “4 *Holzblenden*” (4 wooden blinds), which are claimed to be the lids of the chimneys for the Zyklon B. According to Tauber, however, the alleged lids were made of cement, and therefore the authors must have thought it would be safer not to mention these wooden covers at all.

In practice, as I have demonstrated in chapter 2, the alleged wire-mesh devices for the introduction of Zyklon B were never built, and so in this regard the “converging” testimonies of Kula and Tauber are actually in agreement only in that they are both untrue.[\[866\]](#) And this demonstration, by itself, demolishes the claims of the authors.

As far as the first two aspects of the problem are concerned, the authors assume – on the basis of Tauber’s testimony – that on the roof slab of morgue 1 there were four brick chimneys with cement covers,[\[867\]](#) which contained four openings arranged – in the same way as the chimneys – alternating to the left and to the right of the central beam, according to the drawing in Fig. 2a on p. 79 (see Ill. 1). Neither Tauber nor any other witness, however, ever stated that the chimneys and the holes were situated next to pillars 1, 3, 5, and 7 of the morgue, as the authors assume, and from this point of view their hypothesis has no correspondence in testimony.

The authors have, furthermore, evaded another and certainly not irrelevant question: that of the dimensions of the holes, clearly given by Kula. We shall

later on elucidate why they prefer to remain silent on this point.

4.4. The Objects on the “Train Photograph”

In their effort to demonstrate the presence of the four presumed holes on the roof slab of morgue 1, the authors utilize three photographs – one terrestrial and two aerial.

The first is the well-known shot from the “Kamann” series of February 1943, which has been published and analyzed by Jean-Claude Pressac.^[868] Because of the presence in the foreground of a small locomotive with several little cars, the authors call it the “Train Photograph.”^[869]

In its background, this photograph shows morgue 1 of crematorium II, on top of which there are four unidentifiable objects, which D. Keren and his colleagues take three to be the chimneys for the introduction of Zyklon B. As results from their Fig. 4 on p. 80, they claim to have identified the first two chimneys, starting from south. The third one is said to be “entirely occluded by the smokestack” of the engine (p. 71), whereas the fourth appears for them “just to the left of a locomotive’s smokestack” (p. 71, see Ill. 2a.). The analysis of this photograph by the authors is extremely superficial and skirts purposely many essential elements.

1. First of all, let us state that the presence of chimney #3 behind the smokestack of the locomotive is pure conjecture and does not result from the photograph.

2. Secondly, the claim that the three indistinct objects, which one can see on the roof slab of morgue 1, are introduction chimneys for Zyklon B, is likewise an undemonstrated and not demonstrable assumption, which is even, as we shall see under item 7, contrary to the evidence.

The authors attempt to lend weight to their claim by bringing in two likewise known air photos of the Birkenau area taken on August 25, 1944, with which I shall deal in the next chapter. Anticipating their later arguments, they in fact state the following conclusion:

“That the holes alternate in Crematorium II is supported by the aerial photograph, the Train Photograph, the physical findings, and Tauber’s testimony:” (p. 72)

3. Actually, the indistinct objects taken by the authors to be chimneys 1 and 2 for Zyklon B are both situated on the eastern half of the roof of the mortuary, as shown by the corresponding diagram (see Ill. 2b),

which is at variance with their basic thesis.

4. If one calculates the position of objects 1 and 2 along the median of the surface of the morgue, it results from this diagram that they stood at 7.2 and 10.5 m from the southern end of the morgue. This is fully borne out by the diagram prepared by Provan, on which I have marked by numbers 1 and 2 the position of the respective objects (see Ill. 2i).

This means that object 1 is situated next to pillar #2 and east of the central beam, whereas D. Keren et al. claim that the alleged chimney 1 is next to pillar #1 and west of the central beam. Object 2 is about 3.3 m away from object 1, whereas, according to D. Keren et al., the alleged chimneys 1 and 2 should be located about 7.6 m apart. In Illustration 1a, I have indicated on the diagram of D. Keren et al. the position of objects 1 and 2 with respect to their alleged Zyklon B chimneys 1 and 2.

5. According to D. Keren et al., object 4 should be located slightly in front of the last pillar of the morgue, hence some 4 m from the wall of the crematorium. Instead, it is touching the wall and its height is therefore 45 cm – half the distance between the pair of windows to its left and the plane of the morgue. The windows of the crematorium were, in fact, some 90 cm above the plane of morgue 1, as shown by drawing 1173-1174 (p) [\[870\]](#) and confirmed by the “Train Photograph.” Thus the height of the object is half this distance.

If instead the object had been at the position indicated by the authors, it would be even lower because of the perspective. Already on plan 936 of January 15, 1942, [\[871\]](#) and in the later ones as well, a layer of earth had been specified for the top of morgue 1. Plan 109/16a dated October 9, 1943, gives the exact thickness of this layer: 50 cm. [\[872\]](#) It follows that object 4, rising less than 50 cm above the concrete surface of the morgue, would have been buried in this layer of earth, therefore it could not have been a chimney for Zyklon B.

6. To the left of object 2 is another object on that roof. But because it obviously has a noticeably different shading and shape and because it is located at an inconvenient location, D. Keren et al. simply claim that this can *not* be a Zyklon B chimney. But if we are certain that there is at least one object on that roof which is *not* a Zyklon B chimney, is it not possible that objects 1, 2, and 4 were “other” objects as well?

7. What may these objects have been? The photograph in question does not allow us to solve this riddle, but there is another photograph, also

from the Kamann series, taken a few weeks earlier, which shows the morgue of crematorium II in greater detail (see Ill. 3). On this photograph the alleged chimneys for Zyklon B do not appear at all. In chapter 2.6. of this paper I have already demonstrated that the hypothesis of a creation of holes in the ceiling of morgue 1 for the introduction of Zyklon B is technically absurd and also in total disagreement with one of the principal tenets of the official thesis shared also by the authors.[\[873\]](#)

In the photograph just mentioned, there is an object with square sides, leaning against the wall to the left of the third pair of windows, which seems to be made up by a pile of boxes (see Ill. 3 and 3a). It is odd that the position of this object corresponds exactly to the alleged chimney 4 of the “Train Photograph.” We may have here an alternative explanation of chimney #4.

8. Let us move on to the other two objects. D. Keren et al. assume as an established fact that they were rectangular in shape and answer D. Irving’s hypotheses as follows:

“David Irving has speculated that the holes are really ‘drums containing sealant,’ but it is obvious that this cannot be the case: a cylindrical object would produce a gradual light pattern, while the objects above display a sharp change between uniform light and uniform shadow.” (p. 71)

Actually, this is anything but “obvious.” As is shown by an enlargement of objects 1 and 2, they have a shape that is rounded at top and bottom (see Ill. 2c and 2d), which is absolutely incompatible with the shadow zones of a parallelepiped. This also results from a comparison with one of the ventilation chimneys of the crematorium (Ill. 2e) and the chimney of the ovens (Ill. 2f).

It is therefore clear that the objects have a cylindrical shape.[\[874\]](#) But an object, cylindrical in shape, appears clearly just in front of the south wall of the morgue (see Ill. 2g). Its dimensions, considering that the cylinder is right against the wall, are compatible with the two objects located on top of the morgue. We have here, no doubt, drums that were used during the construction. A similar cylinder, identifiable as a metal barrel, appears also in a photograph, which shows the erection of the chimney of crematorium III (Ill. 2h). David Irving’s hypothesis therefore remains the most probable one.

4.5. The Marks on an Air Photo of August 25, 1944

Let us move on to the second alleged proof of the existence of four chimneys for Zyklon B on the roof slab of morgue 1 in crematorium II. The two air photos of August 25, 1944,[\[875\]](#) in particular the one labeled 3185 (see Ill. 4), show on this surface four dark spots of irregular shapes which the authors explain as follows:

“The smudges are too large to belong just to the holes themselves. They probably correspond to the tamping down of a trail on the roof by the SS men detailed to introduce the canisters. The photograph shows the smudges alternating slightly, Holes 1 and 3 to the west, 2 and 4 to the east. A Sonderkommando survivor, Henryk Tauber, considered a reliable witness on technical issues, testified that the holes in Crematorium II were on alternating sides.” (p. 72)

The authors had the photographs analyzed by “an expert on aerial photo interpretation, Carroll Lucas,” none other than the “expert” previously picked by that expert in trickery, John C. Zimmerman![\[876\]](#) A few pages on, they report his findings:

“It is impossible to observe the Zyklon holes themselves in any of the aerial photographs. [...].

Mr. Lucas analyzed the two August 25 photos showing the roof of the Crematorium II. [...]. After careful study Mr. Lucas identified four small objects within the smudges, all slightly elevated above the level of the roof. Stereo imaging allows observation of even small objects in grainy images, very difficult or impossible to detect in separate images, as is well demonstrated by ‘random dot stereograms.’ In all probability, these correspond to the four ‘chimneys’ above the holes in the roof, as clearly visible in the Train Photograph. Thus, the aerial photographs add further support to the witness testimonies and to the Train Photograph. With regard to the dark smudges and related findings Mr. Lucas summarized his conclusions as follows:

a) ‘The roof of the partially underground wing of the Crematorium contains four raised vents, possibly with covers larger than their exits’.

b) ‘The four dark areas observed on the Crematorium II roof (on positive prints) are compacted soil, produced by the constant movement of personnel deployed on the roof, as they worked around the vents.’ [...].

c) ‘The thin dark lineation (on positive prints) interconnecting the dark

areas is a path of compacted earth produced by personnel moving from vent to vent.'

d) 'The dark area connecting this path to the edge roof from the vent nearest to the Crematorium roof is an extension of the path which shows where personnel gained access to the roof – possibly using a short ladder leaned against the roof.'

e) 'The evidence provided by this analysis lends credence to the fact the vents existed and were used in a way consistent with statements from multiple witnesses.'" (pp. 95f.)

We will now look at the soundness of these observations.

I note, first of all, that the claim of the authors that “the photograph shows the smudges alternating slightly, Holes 1 and 3 to the west, 2 and 4 to the east” is wrong. It is sufficient to delineate the shape of the morgue and to draw in the central beam that ran through it lengthwise to see that, in reality, the four smudges are all on the eastern half of the roof slab, as is clearly shown in Illustration 4b. This deals the authors’ thesis a decisive blow.

Their comment on Lucas’ observations is really incredible: they state that “it is impossible to observe the Zyklon holes themselves,” but still Lucas did identify “four small objects within the smudges,” which, however, are “very difficult or impossible to detect in separate images.” In other words “the four small objects” cannot be seen, but – in an act of faith – they still have to be there! Finally, these objects, invisible as they are, correspond “in all probability” to the chimneys for Zyklon B!

What are Lucas’ observations?

a. He claims that the cover of morgue 1 shows “four raised vents, possibly with covers”: but how can he make a statement like that if it is impossible to observe the four alleged objects in separate images? And how was he able to see even the covers (!) of the alleged chimneys?

Here, our “expert” has been somewhat imprudent, because he uses the term “vents.” Now, as the authors explain in the introduction, the alleged openings for the introduction of Zyklon B are “sometimes called vents” (p. 68) in English. As the objects are invisible and hence unidentifiable, Lucas’ statement is not technical but purely propagandist: he simply claimed to have seen what the authors wanted him to see. This ideological and propagandistic character of Lucas’ declarations clearly shows through also in his further statements.

b. He claims that the smudges one can see on the cover of the

morgue “are compacted soil, produced by the constant movement of personnel deployed on the roof, as they worked around the vents.” Even assuming that this is technically sound – which, as we will see, it is not – we again run into the propagandist motivation: the smudges were caused by the personnel assigned to the gassings! How does he know that? An impenetrable mystery!

Let us analyze his technical explanation. The Birkenau area is known to be sandy. On the photograph in question the soil of the inner yard of crematorium II (but also at crematorium III) is white, except for areas with flower beds or vegetation. So, by what extraordinary physico-chemical phenomenon would the white sand have become black when it was repeatedly walked on by a pair of SS men?[877]

The authors come up with yet another and even more nonsensical explanation. The “inner core” of the columns, i.e. the alleged movable “can” into which the Zyklon B was poured, had been “temporarily removed and propped against the small chimney that housed the Zyklon insertion devices” (p. 97). But, according to Kula, this “can”

“was an empty column made of a thin zinc lamina with a square section of about 150 mm.”[878]

It was correctly drawn by Pressac.[879] But if the Zyklon B chimneys, which according to the authors measured “about 60 x 60 cm” (purely invented dimensions), are completely invisible in the photographs in question, how can anyone claim that devices 15 by 15 cm and at most one meter long could create smudges of some 3-4 m long and 1-2 m wide?

c. Lucas’s statement that the four smudges are linked to “a path of compacted earth produced by personnel moving from vent to vent” is likewise propagandist. As long as the objection in relation to the change of color of compacted sand remains valid, on what grounds can one assume that the presumed compacting had produced “a path” and that it had been produced by the SS personnel allegedly assigned to the gassings?

d. Lucas claims furthermore to have identified, west of the fourth dark spot, the access “where personnel gained access to the roof.” It takes some imagination to see in this extension of the smudge a footpath, all the more so since this extension finishes half-way between the smudge and the outer edge of the morgue (see Ill. 4a). And if applied to morgue 1 of crematorium III, then it becomes totally absurd (see Ill. 4c): There the dark smudges run in a distinct angle, which would mean that the SS men were

walking from one chimney to another in odd angles for some 3-4 meters, then suddenly leaping 3 to 6 meters to the next spot – without run-up!

That Lucas' observations have no technical relevance but are only propagandist in nature results finally from an important fact, to which he has obviously paid no attention at all. The ground of the yards in crematoria II and III consisted of the same sand which (presumably) covered morgues 1 and 2. From the point of view of the official historiography, if Lucas' explanation were true, the thousands upon thousands of Jews who had trodden this sand before being gassed in these two crematoria should have created a literal highway of dark sand, from the gate of the yard to the entrance of morgue 2, the alleged undressing room. But the air photos do not show even the slightest trace of supposedly compacted dark sand. But then how can anyone seriously argue that the smudges on morgue 1 have been caused by the sand being compacted under the boots of two men?

This shows how much the opinion of this "expert" is really worth.

The air photos of May 31, 1944, are known for not showing dark spots on the roof of morgue 1 of the crematorium. This is how the authors explain that fact:

"One possible explanation is that the camouflage in the Crematorium area in general, and the gas chamber in particular, changed over time. [...]"

It is therefore reasonable to assume that between May 31 and July 8, the earth banks were flattened and the roof covered with earth. This newly placed earth was compacted by the SS-men climbing onto the roof and walking between the holes." (p. 96)

I will stress, first of all, that the conjecture of the authors regarding the nature and the development of the spots is unfounded. Secondly, the camouflage of the crematoria consisted merely of a fence to be built around them. The respective order was given to the Central Construction Office by SS *Brigadeführer* Hans Kammler, head of Office Group C at the SS-WVHA, by telegram on May 12, 1944.[\[880\]](#) On May 16th, SS *Obersturmführer* Werner Jothann, head of Central Construction Office, drew up a list of the quantities of steel needed for the fence,[\[881\]](#) which, according to the respective "situation map," was to be a rectangle of 100 m by 125 m around each of the crematoria II and III, and of 75 m by 100 m around crematoria IV and V.[\[882\]](#)

The air photos of May 31, 1944, show, for crematorium II, a fence that is

nearly complete, except for the south-east corner (see Ill. 5). A letter from SS *Sturmbannführer* Karl Bischoff (then head of Construction Inspectorate of the Waffen-SS “Schlesien”), dated May 17, 1944, explains that the fences were “Security measures (camouflage) of the crematoria in concentration camp II Auschwitz.”^[883] In this context, one cannot understand the sense of “camouflaging” the morgues 1 by covering them with sand. We have already seen that the earth cover was already specified in plan 936 of the crematorium, dated January 15, 1942. A further photograph from the Kamann series published by Pressac,^[884] probably dating from the summer of 1943, shows the south-eastern corner of morgue I (cf. above, chapter 2.5., p. 297). This corner appears flat and clean whereas to its right one can clearly see a grassy surface on an inclined plane of sand which slopes down gently towards a point below the second pair of windows of the crematorium. From this we can deduce that at the time sand was banked up only against the sides of the morgue but there was none on top of it.

I have explained the spots on the morgues in chapter 2, assuming that in 1944 the roof was devoid of sand, as results clearly already from the first photograph of the ruins of morgue 1, dating from 1945.^[885]

The air photo dated December 21, 1944, confirms this fact (see Ill. 6). It shows crematorium II being dismantled. Morgue 2 appears to be uncovered. The roof and a large portion of the chimney have been taken down. Morgue 1 shows quite angular contours, which means that the concrete cover was surely laid bare.

On the roof slab one can see two dark spots, more or less where spots 3 and 4 appeared in the photograph taken on August 25, 1944. Parallel to them there are two more spots along the eastern edge of the roof slab. Another, fainter spot appears roughly where the first spot shows up in the photograph of August 25, 1944, but it extends eastward into another equally faint spot. The second spot of the photograph of August 25, 1944, does not show up this time. Together, this confirms that the explanation of the spots given by the authors is completely unfounded.

4.6. The Openings in the Ruins of the Roof Slab of Morgue 1 in Crematorium II

The authors claim to have found “strong physical evidence” in the ruins of morgue 1 of crematorium II (p. 73) for three out of the four presumed holes

for the introduction of Zyklon B.

Before we take a closer look at their “discoveries,” it is necessary to make a few remarks.

1. First of all, the authors refer to an “architectural rule,” already distorted by Provan, according to which[\[886\]](#)

“when violent stress is put on a concrete structure, cracks show up passing through holes made previous to the violent force, since the holes makes the structure weaker in that location.”

The authors use Provan’s untenable hypothesis and argue, that the violence of the explosion would have broken up the smooth edges of the alleged openings which, therefore, are no longer recognizable as such. Actually, as I have demonstrated by means of photographs, the smooth edges of the five rectangular ventilation openings in the ceiling of the furnace hall of crematorium III and of the round opening of the de-aeration tube in the ceiling of morgue 2 of crematorium II have remained practically intact in spite of the violent explosion, which ripped the rooms apart. The respective openings are perfectly identifiable as such.[\[887\]](#)

2. The identification of the alleged openings was done by the authors at home in their office, and in the most wilful manner: they have simply selected from the large number of holes and cracks of all shapes and sizes, which can be found in the ruins of the roof of morgue 1, those that are closest to their assumed pattern of the positions of the alleged openings for the introduction of Zyklon B.

3. In their fictitious identification, the authors have been careful to leave out the most important testimonial element regarding the dimensions of the alleged openings, because none of the holes they have so laboriously identified agrees with these dimensions.

Michał Kula, the self-styled maker of the alleged wire-mesh columns for the introduction of Zyklon B, has in fact declared that they had a square cross-sectional area of 70 cm × 70 cm and were 3 meters high, thus rising through the ceiling and protruding from it by (300 – 241 – 18 =) 41 cm.²⁶ For the installation of such a device it was therefore necessary to make an opening in the reinforced concrete slightly larger than 70 cm × 70 cm. Any brick chimneys would have measured at least (12 + 70 + 12 =) 94 cm × 94 cm (and not 60 cm × 60 cm, as the authors assert), because the standard bricks of the type “Altes Reich” at the time had a thickness of 12 cm.

4. Finally, the authors assume that the ruins at the time of their investigations (1998 – 2000) were exactly the same as those at the end of 1944 when the SS blew up crematorium II – as we shall see, this is a totally unsound hypothesis.

4.6.1. Opening #1

The authors state:

“Hole 1 is the opening in the roof near Pillar 1 (Figure 11a). The pillar remains standing and protrudes through the surface of the roof (Figure 10b), which shifted as it collapsed. While it might appear at first glance that the opening could just as easily have been created by the explosion, careful examination proves thus was not the case. Portions of straight, flat edges and a 90-degree angle survive intact, though most of the concrete around the edge was damaged by explosion. The center of this hole is 4.1 m from the southern end of the roof slab, and 0.75 m west of the roof’s center. We estimate its size approximately 0.5 m square; this places its eastern edge at 0.3 m west of the western edge of the central support beam.” (pp. 74f.)

This opening corresponds to Provan’s opening #2. I have already amply demonstrated in chapter 2.7.3. that this is not an original opening but was produced by the Soviets or the Poles in 1945.[\[888\]](#)

I will add here that the claim of the authors that, in this opening, “portions of straight, flat edges and a 90-degree angle survive intact, though most of the concrete around the edge was damaged by explosion,” is true, albeit on a very small scale, but, as I have demonstrated by means of photographs which I have taken over the years, this rough squaring of the hole was carried out between 1992 and 1997 by a pious pair of hands from the Auschwitz Museum wanting, in this way, to render the tale of the Zyklon B openings more credible.[\[889\]](#)

When it comes to the dimensions of the opening, the authors state that it measures about 0.5 meters square. In June 1990, this opening had a trapezoidal shape, the longest side measuring 86 cm, and a maximum width of 50 cm, the narrowest being 43 cm. However, as already stated, according to the witness Kula, the openings should have been at least 70 by 70 cm. One can thus easily see why the authors do not even in passing speak of Kula!

Van Pelt had already prepared a little sleight of hand to solve this problem. He had, in fact, presented a drawing,[\[890\]](#) which purports to show

the make-up of the device described by Kula, but which actually contains a diverging and arbitrary element: a constriction of the column at the level of the ceiling, with the width of the device dropping from 70 cm in morgue 1 itself to 48 cm within the roof slab and on the outside.

Van Pelt writes that during the work on his book (published in 2002) he had Mazal, Keren, and McCarthy “as partners in a daily conversation,” hence this trick is certainly the result of a joint strategy devised by the four “specialists” in order to leave aside Kula’s declaration mentioned above.

4.6.2. Opening #2

Opening #2, as results from figure 12 reproduced by the authors on their p. 85, is the same as Provan’s opening #6. Actually, we are dealing here with a simple fissure caused by the crash of this part of the ceiling onto the sustaining pillar #6; this is shown clearly by my Illustrations 30 and 31 (see p. 336f.). In an effort to create the illusion that this crack is instead an opening that existed before the explosion, the authors are obliged to use a tedious expedient: to draw into this shapeless crack a dotted square which is to show the outline of the presumed original opening. To this square, they assign sides of 0.5 by 0.5 meters (p. 75), again at variance with those given by Kula: 0.7 by 0.7 meters.

4.6.3. Opening #3

In this respect, the authors write:

“Hole 3’s projected location is in an area of the roof that is badly damaged and covered with rubble.”

Unfortunately they had not received permission from the Auschwitz Museum to disturb the rubble (p. 75), so the presumed opening does exist, but it cannot be seen!

In reality here, too, the authors again take recourse to an ordinary trick. Their photograph of the area in question (figure 15 on p. 85) presents a very restricted field of vision and was taken from the west looking east. It is sufficient to widen the field of vision and to invert the position (from east looking west)^[891] to realize that this area is not only not particularly “badly damaged” but that we have here two long cracks (one of which is Provan’s opening #8). These cracks have so little in common with the alleged openings for Zyklon B that the authors preferred to remain quiet about them and would rather have us believe that an invisible opening #3 does indeed exist!

4.6.4. Opening #4

The identification of opening #4 is decidedly more fanciful. The authors explain:

“Hole 4 can be identified by a pattern in the rebar (Figure 16) at the very northern end of what remains of the roof. [...] Hole 4 can be identified by the unimpeded square opening set in the rebar in 1943. The surrounding edges were shattered by the explosion and the folding of the roof, leaving only the telltale rebar latticework. Its measurements are 0.5 x 0.5 m. [...] The deliberately looped rebar proves that this hole, as almost certainly the other three, was cast at the time the concrete was poured in January 1943.” (pp. 75f.)

Let us examine the photograph of this alleged Zyklon B opening (see Ill. 7 and 7a). The first thing that strikes the eye is the supporting pillar for the morgue ceiling, which protrudes from this hole. The vertical traces of the planking used in the construction of this pillar are clearly visible, as are the ends of the steel rods sticking out of its top. The crack is clearly the result of the ceiling crashing onto this pillar. In fact, as the authors concede, “the roof shifted considerably when it collapsed after the explosions,” which means that the ceiling rose and then fell back with its central beam out of line with the row of pillars, some of which pierced the ceiling. This is borne out by the fact that next to the alleged opening 1 one can see the top of the first concrete pillar, which has pierced the roof of the morgue creating an opening of its own (see Ill. 8).

Secondly, this crack does not have proper sides, to say nothing of smooth edges, which would not have disappeared altogether as demonstrated by the vents of the furnace hall of crematorium III or the ventilation hole of morgue 2 in crematorium II.

Thirdly, in the square formed by the rebars, to which the authors attribute so much importance, the lateral bars have not been cut as would have been necessary to erect the brick chimneys around the opening, but only bent: in Illustration 7a, I have numbered 1-5 those that can be seen best, with “P” standing for the pillar.

The claim of the authors that this square of rebars is a direct proof that it was created in 1943 is frankly ridiculous. Over the years, the ruins of morgue 1 of crematorium II have undergone work and manipulations on several occasions. I will limit myself to the best documented ones. First of all, as early as 1946 the ruins of morgue 1 were the object of soundings and

diggings undertaken by the expert Roman Dawidowski who worked under the orders of judge Jan Sehn.[892]

In 1968, a group of Germans did precise archeological research and diggings at this site. Pressac has published four photographs thereof.[893]

Furthermore, between 1990 and 2000 the alleged opening 1 – as I have already stated – was enlarged and squared. Provan’s opening #7 has undergone similar manipulations: in 1990, it presented five rebars up to 40 cm long bent backwards; in 2000, the opening had been roughly squared and four of those rebars had been cut.[894]

How is it possible, then, to claim seriously that, in 1998, the status of the rebars in the alleged opening 4 reflects the original conditions? And how can one take such stupidity to be a “proof”? The authors just did not know what to base themselves on to “demonstrate” the existence of the fourth alleged Zyklon B opening!

4.7. Robert Jan van Pelt’s Hypothesis

In his brief for the Irving-Lipstadt trial, van Pelt has retained as “logical” that the alleged openings for Zyklon b in morgue 1 of crematorium II had been refilled by the SS before they blew up the ceiling of this room.[895]

The authors hold this hypothesis to be unfounded and support their opinion with these arguments:

“It has been further hypothesized that the difficulty of locating the four holes may have reflected their having been filled in before the destruction of the chamber. This does not seem likely for Crematoriums II and III. The original roof consisted of three layers: a thick stone aggregate concrete slab underneath; a thinner, finer sand-aggregate concrete mixture above; and waterproofing bituminous tar paper in the middle. It is unlikely that the SS would have thought it necessary to duplicate this work, or that they could have done so in four places without leaving a trace. There are considerable areas of the original ceiling visible from under the slab but these show no signs of tampering. In Crematorium I the holes were filled when the structure was converted to a bomb shelter for the SS (date unknown).” (p. 73)

Let me stress right away that, on account of a kind of understandable reticence, Keren, McCarthy, and Mazal did not want to come out and say that the author of such nonsense was none other than their greatest expert on

Auschwitz, Robert Jan van Pelt!

Much more important, though, is the fact that the arguments used by the authors are exactly those I had used in chapter 2 of this present paper, including the reference to the ceiling of the alleged gas chamber in crematorium I,[\[896\]](#) which presents clearly apparent traces of four round openings that have been filled in, but which have nothing to do with the alleged openings for the introduction of Zyklon B.[\[897\]](#) A case in point? Whichever way it is, the authors have recognized the full validity of my argumentation.

4.8. “Additional Findings”

The authors present further “additional findings,” the most important of which, with respect to the presumed extermination, are the following three:

4.8.1. A Small Opening

The first is “a small rectangular 4 x 10 cm aperture” in the ceiling of the morgue (p. 93). The authors explain its function as follows:

“It was possibly fitted with a removable gasket that allowed the insertion of a detector to test the concentration of gas: it is known that the crematoriums were equipped for this purpose.” (pp. 93f.)

Aside from the fact that there is no proof of this opening being original, the authors’ explanation is funny rather than unfounded, because they, like all the other nincompoops of their ilk, believe that a “detector” for hydrogen cyanide was some kind of mechanical device that could be placed into the “gas chamber.” As all revisionist scholars know, the “Gasrestprobe” for hydrogen cyanide involved reactive cardboard strips soaked in a chemical solution, which was prepared on the spot.[\[898\]](#) Hence, that opening, if it really is original, could be used for anything but what the authors maintain.

4.8.2. Shower Heads

The second “discovery” consists in the finding, within the area of morgue 1, of a disc from “a probable false showerhead” (figures 22 and 23 on p. 88), of which no one knows when or by whom it was thrown where the authors found it. Scenarios like this are not uncommon.

As early as the 1980s, Pressac had found near the hole, which the authors take to be opening #1, a cement cover of one of the inspection shafts of the

sewer in the crematorium, which I, in 1991, found in the opening.[\[899\]](#) As we have already seen, Tauber had stated that the presumed chimneys for the Zyklon B had cement lids, and one of his zealous admirers must have felt a duty to create a “converging proof” by means of this kind of arrangement!

As far as the tale of the fake showers is concerned, so cherished in the holocaust literature, I have already demonstrated in another article that the Central Construction Office, within the framework of the “special measures for the improvement of hygienic installations” in the Birkenau camp ordered by Kammler in early May 1943, had planned a “shower installation for detainees” in the basement of crematoria II and III and that the 14 showers, which are mentioned in the transfer agreement for crematorium III of June 24, 1943 (inventory of morgue 1), belonged to this project and were real, not fake.[\[900\]](#)

4.8.3. Pieces of Wood

The final “discovery” of the authors is a series of rectangular blocks set into the ceiling of the morgue:

“A number of small (approximately 10 x 15 x 4 cm), rectangular cast indentations can be seen in the ceiling of the gas chamber. At least six of these are visible in those portions of the ceiling presently accessible from below. [...] One important detail must be emphasized: the indentations containing the wooden blocks were purposely built into the ceiling of the gas chamber from the very moment the roof was built.” (p. 94)

These blocks had already been seen by Pressac in the 1980s: in his first book on Auschwitz he showed two photographs of them, assuming that they were wooden bases for fake showers.[\[901\]](#) The authors do not say so explicitly, but clearly want the reader to believe this. They claim, in fact, that “this fixture” – i.e. the disc of the alleged fake shower and the rectangular blocks – “undoubtedly formed part of the elaborate plan to keep the victims ignorant of their fate as long as possible” (p. 95). Is there any foundation to this explanation?

In June of 1990, having attentively read Pressac’s first book on Auschwitz, I went to Birkenau for the first time, accompanied by two engineers. One of our very first investigations concerned precisely these blocks, which I photographed repeatedly, also during my later visits (Ill. 9 and 10). I identified eight of them inside the morgue (including the empty holes in the concrete, which had originally contained them, Ill. 11). They are

arranged in two parallel lines to the right and left of the central beam, at a distance of about 1.65 meters from the beam and about 1.90 meters from one another. The dimensions vary slightly (10 cm × 11 cm; 9 cm × 12 cm), the thickness is 4 centimeters. The individual pairs of blocks (or empty holes in the concrete) are located lengthwise and alternating with respect to the pillars of the morgue. These blocks are set into the concrete, which means that they had been put there already when the concrete was poured. Therefore, when dealing with the woodwork for this job, the architects of the Central Construction Office took care of placing wooden blocks for fake shower-heads, but would have completely forgotten about installing openings for the introduction of Zyklon B!? Can anyone really dare to seriously utter such nonsense?

What was the use of those blocks? If we follow Pressac, the architects of the Central Construction Office had thought up 14 fake showers in a space of 210 square meters in an effort to “fool” some thousand persons: not really much to “fool” so many people!

The inspections of the mortuary in crematorium I supply us with the solution to this apparent mystery. Eight supporting beams of this hall present, in fact, in their center wooden blocks of the same type set into the concrete (see Ill. 12). The lamps that now light up this room are fixed to three of them.

Therefore, these blocks were simply the bases, to which the lamps of morgue 1 were attached. This is confirmed also by a document. Plan 2197[b] (r) of crematorium II, dated March 19, 1943,[\[902\]](#) shows the pattern of the lamps for this hall: eight pairs of lamps are arranged in two parallel rows on both sides of the central beam, at equal distance from the pillars, i.e. at 1.90 meters from one another.

This corresponds to the positions of the blocks in question. As far as the width of the morgue is concerned, the lamps are situated next to the central beam, but it is reasonable to assume that they were actually located in the middle of each of the two halves of this room, i.e. at an intermediate distance between the beam and the opposite wall (3.3 meters), hence at about 1.65 m from the beam where, in fact, the blocks can be seen. If they had really been at the place shown in the drawing, they would have provided poor illumination for their section of the hall, and even worse for the other side, because the central beam, with its thickness of 55 cm, would have created broad shadow zones.

The strange placement on the drawing of the pairs of lamps right next to

the central beam on either side may have the following explanation: in the western half of the morgue we also have a waste-water channel, which ran lengthwise between the central beam and the opposite wall in such a way that if the lamps had been drawn in at the location where the blocks are situated, the symbol (a small circle with an x in the center) for the seven lamps on this side of the room would have been superimposed on the lines of the channel and confusion might have resulted.

4.9. Conclusion

The authors claim to have furnished a concordance of evidence regarding the existence of the alleged openings for the introduction of Zyklon B in the ceiling of morgue 1 of crematorium II at Birkenau, on the basis of Tauber's testimony, the "Train Photograph" and their own archeological findings.

This concordance is, in practice, purely fictitious for the following reasons:

1. The wire-mesh devices for Zyklon B allegedly fabricated by Kula never existed, therefore Tauber who claims to have seen them, is a false witness like Kula.
- 2a. The "Train Photograph" shows fuzzy objects of irregular shape, which only with fanciful conjecture can be considered to be chimneys for the introduction of Zyklon B.
- 2b. The alleged chimney #3 does not appear on the photograph and its existence is an arbitrary conjecture.
- 2c. The three indistinct objects, which the authors take to be chimneys for Zyklon B, are all on the eastern half of the roof slab of the morgue, which is at variance with their basic theses.
- 2d. Object #3 can be identified as the object, which can be seen in the same position on the photograph of January 1943 and is therefore not a chimney for Zyklon B.
- 2e. Objects #1 and #2 had a cylindrical shape and could therefore not be chimneys for Zyklon B.
- 2f. Object #1 stands to the east of pillar #2 instead of to the west of pillar #1.
- 2g. Another object on the roof is ignored by Keren et al., because it does fit into their hypothesis neither by location nor by shape: it is not a Zyklon B chimney.

3a. On the air photos of August 25, 1944, the chimneys are absolutely invisible and only fanciful conjecture allows the authors to affirm that they existed.

3b. The explanation of the smudges present on the ceiling of morgue 1 is absolutely erroneous.

3c. The smudges were all on the eastern half of the roof slab of morgue 1, which again is at variance with the fundamental thesis of the authors.

4a. The alleged openings for the introduction of Zyklon B that the authors claim to have “discovered” are not original.

4b. Opening #1 was created in 1945 by the Soviets or by the Poles.

4c. Opening #2 is a simple crack caused by the crash of this part of the ceiling on sustaining pillar #6.

4d. Opening #3, according to the authors themselves, is invisible.

4e. Opening #4 was created by the pillar which protrudes from it.

4f. The alleged openings for the introduction of Zyklon B “discovered” by the authors all have dimensions in disagreement with those indicated by the witness Kula.


4g. All openings are irregular in shape and do not have properly crafted edges; the reinforcement bars have not been removed; there is no trace of mortar.

4h. There are no traces in the concrete (ceiling, pillars, floor) indicating that any steel columns for introducing Zyklon B had been fastened to it.


5. The blocks set into the ceiling of the morgue did not serve as bases for the fixation of fake showers, but for the attachment of lamps lighting up this room.

The alleged “forensic investigation” by Daniel Keren, Jamie McCarthy, and Henry W. Mazal thus has no value, be it historical or technical.

4.10. Documents and Photos




Ill. 1: Position of the alleged openings for Zyklon B (H1-4) in the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II at Birkenau according to Daniel Keren et al.[\[1\]](#)




Ill. 1a: Position of objects 1 and 2 of the “train photo” (Ill. 2) on the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II in relation to the alleged openings for Zyklon B and to the support pillars of the room.
Source: cf. Ill. 1, 2b.




Ill. 2: Section of photograph of crematorium II at Birkenau, February 1943.[\[2\]](#)



Ill. 2a: Section enlargement of Ill. 2. The numbers 1, 2, and 4 indicate the objects or alleged Zyklon B chimneys on the roof of morgue 1, as claimed by Keren et al. The letter "C" indicates an object of cylindrical shape.





Ill. 2b:
Section
enlargement
of Ill . 2.
Cf. Ill . 1.
Diagram of
the
positions of
the three
objects on
the morgue.




Ill. 2c: Enlarged section from Ill. 2, objects #1 and #2.




Ill. 2d: Section from Ill. 2, further enlarged objects #1 and #2.



Ill. 2e: Section enlargement of Ill . 2: ventilation chimney for morgue 1.




Ill. 2f: Section enlargement of Ill . 2. Chimney of the Crematorium.



Ill. 2g: Section from Ill . 2. Cylindrical object at the southern wall of morgue 1.



Ill. 2h: Photo of crematorium II from January 1943. Section enlargement of a cylindrical object (metal barrel) in the foreground.[\[3\]](#)



Ill. 2i: Triangulation diagram for the objects #1 and #2 (and omitted object #3) on the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium II, drawn by C.D. Provan.[\[4\]](#) My numbers 1 and 2 mark the position of the respective objects. The third (right-most) line refers to an object, which D. Keren et al. do not consider to be a chimney for Zyklon B.




Ill. 3: Photography of crematorium II in Birkenau, January 1943.


[\[5\]](#)




Ill. 3a: Section enlargement of Ill . 3.



Ill. 4: Crematorium II at Birkenau in the air photo of August 25, 1944 (north is at the top).[\[6\]](#)




Ill. 4a: Section enlargement of Ill . 4. (north to the right)



Ill. 4b: as Ill . 4a. Position of dark spots.



Ill. 4c: Dark smudges on the roof of morgue 1 of crematorium III (from same photo as Ill . 4): allegedly caused by SS men walking from one chimney to another. But consider the path they must have taken: walking in an angle for 4 meters, then leaping to the next spot!



III. 5: *Crematorium II in Birkenau in an air photo of May 31, 1944.*[\[7\]](#)




III. 6: *Crematorium II in Birkenau in an air photo on Dec. 21, 1944.*[\[8\]](#)



Figure 16. Remains of fourth (seen from south) Zyklon hole. Rebar skirts two sides, ends at other two sides bent inward and looped back. Note rotated roof slab showing formwork on inner side.

III. 7: *The alleged opening #4 for Zyklon B according to Keren et al.*[\[9\]](#)



Ill. 7a: as Ill. 7, the pillar and the bent rebars marked.



***III. 8:** Morgue 1 of crematorium II at Birkenau. Concrete pillar protruding from concrete roof slab and the crack produced by the pillar. August 2000. © Carlo Mattogno.*



Ill. 9: *One of the supporting blocks for lamps in the ceiling of morgue 1 of crematorium II at Birkenau. October 1991. © Carlo Mattogno.*



Ill. 10: *Another one of the supporting blocks for lamps in the ceiling of morgue 1 of crematorium II at Birkenau. October 1991. © Carlo Mattogno.*



III. 11: Recess in the concrete ceiling of morgue 1 of crematorium II at Birkenau for a supporting block for the lamps.
July 1992. © Carlo Mattogno.



III. 12: Morgue of crematorium I at Auschwitz. One of the blocks set into the center of the supporting beam of the ceiling.
October 1991. © Carlo Mattogno.

Document Souces

Abbreviations

AGK:	<i>Archiwum Głównej Komisji Badania Zbrodni Przeciwko Narodowi Polskiemu Instytutu Pamięci Narodowej</i> (Archive of the Central Commission of Investigation into the Crimes against the Polish People – National Monument), Warsaw
APMO:	<i>Archiwum Państwowego Muzeum w Oświęcimiu</i> (Archive of the National Museum at Auschwitz)
GARF:	<i>Gosudarstvenni Archiv Rossiskoi Federatsii</i> (State Archive of the Russian Federation), Moscow
IMT:	International Military Tribunal, Nuremberg 1947
NA:	<i>National Archives</i> , Washington D.C.
RGVA:	<i>Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennii Vojennii Archiv</i> (Russian State Archive for War), Moscow
ZStL:	<i>Zentrale Stelle der Landesjustizverwaltungen</i> (Central Office of the State's Justice Administrations), Ludwigsburg

Index of Names

Individuals only. Entries from footnotes in italics.

— A —

Adelsberger, Lucie: 107
Alicia, Auschwitz tour guide: 217f.
Alstine, Mark van: 91, 174-176, 179f.
Aly, Götz: 265
Arad, Yitzhak: 35
Auerbach, Hellmuth: 15, 18
Aynat, Enrique: 203, 350

— B —

Backes, Uwe: 15
Bailer, Josef: 15, 16f., 49f., 75
Bailer-Galanda, Brigitte: 16
Ball, John Clive: 48, 169-171, 291, 292
Bastian, Till: 17f.
Belgion, Montgomery: 37
Bendel, Charles Sigismund: 206f., 228, 283, 286-289
Bendel, Paul: see Bendel, Charles Sigismund
Benz, Wolfgang: 15f., 35, 244-246
Berenbaum, Michael: 79, 95, 156, 181, 228, 230, 311, 349
Berg, Friedrich Paul: 36, 203
Bernfus, Erich: 36
Bezwinska, Jadwiga: 208
Billig, Joseph: 162, 254
Bimko, Ada: 206, 208
Bischoff, Karl: 93, 97, 109, 114f., 118, 122, 138, 148-158, 168, 188f., 218f., 227, 293, 296, 300f., 342, 371
Blobel, Paul: 209, 244
Boisdefeu, Jean-Marie: 203, 224f., 291, 297, 364
Braker, William: 197
Brayard, Florent: 18
Breymesser, Hermann: 36
Briant, Nevin: 228
Bringmann, Fritz: 35
Broad, Pery S.: 32, 220-224, 343
Broszat, Martin: 222, 256-258, 262, 277
Browning, Christopher R.: 243

Brugioni, Dino: 179, 291
Butler, Rupert: 8
Butz, Arthur R.: 31, 66, 203

— C —

Cajani, Luigi: 171
Chazan, Shaul: 362
Choumoff, Pierre-Serge: 35
Christmann, Carl Hermann: 197
Christophersen, Thies: 13f.
Clarke, Bernard: 222
Cobb, Augustus: 101
Cole, David: 63, 203, 211, 215-218
Colombo, G.: 231
Conan, Eric: 218
Connolly, Cyril: 9
Countess, Robert H.: 20, 203
Créteur, Louis: 91f., 178
Crowell, Samuel: 20, 203, 237
Czech, Danuta: 32, 89, 94, 96, 109, 119, 153, 155-157, 161, 162, 172, 182, 184, 208, 214, 229, 295f., 303, 313
Czernin, Wolfgang: 78

— D —

Dawidowski, Roman: 100, 309f., 375
Deana, Franco: 88, 99, 169, 187
Deckert, Walter: 197
Dejaco, Walter: 189, 295
Demjanjuk, John: 30
Distel, Barbara: 35
Domarus, Max: 251, 253
Dreßen, Willi: 35
Duda, Walter H.: 78
Dunin-Wasoswicz, Krzysztof: 35
Dwork, Deborah: 158, 217, 299

— E —

Eichmann, Adolf: 244, 247, 248f.
Epstein, Joseph: 49, 51, 58
Erber, Josef: 283-285
Erichsen, Hugo: 92, 110

— F —

Faurisson, Robert: 8, 15, 23f., 30, 31, 34, 39, 62, 65, 74, 121, 195, 203, 210, 214, 216, 222, 279-282, 283, 292, 350

Faye, Jean-Pierre: 35
Feinsilber. Alter: see Jankowski, Stanisław
Felderer, Ditlieb: 282
Ferency, László: 271f.
Fischer, Konrad: 61
Fleming, Gerald: 111f., 117, 284
Forth, Wolfgang: 37
Foxman, Abraham: 12
Fraenkel, H.: 259
Frank, Hans: 209, 255-259
Franke-Gricksch, Alfred: 283
Frei, Nobert: 35
Freyer, Anne: 226
Friedmann, Dr.: 283
Fritzsich, Karl: 190
Fröhlich, H.: 91f., 178
Furey, Ron: 211

— G —

Gardner, Henry: 342, 360
Gärtner, Michael: 27
Gauss, Ernst: 16, 31, 49, 59, 66, 81, 88, 99, 134, 213, 224, 291, (=Rudolf, Germar)
Gavard, Jean: 35
Gerstein, Kurt: 210-212
Gilbert, Gustave M.: 241
Gilbert, Martin: 210f., 223
Giua, Michele: 41, 309
Giua-Lollini, Clara: 41, 309
Gloxhuber, Christian: 37
Goebbels, Josef: 257-261
Goppelsroeder, Friedrich: 147
Göring, Hermann: 248
Gozani, Ohad: 269
Grabner, Maximilian: 160
Graf, Jürgen: 26, 33, 36, 76, 82, 111, 203, 231-237, 243, 249, 251, 256, 259, 262, 270, 272, 306
Granata, Russell: 87, 122, 171, 172, 281f.
Gray, Charles: 20, 195, 283
Green, Richard J.: 281, see the entire chapter 'Green sees Red'
Greif, Guideon: 362
Greiser, Arthur: 250
Grieb, Conrad: 79
Grobman, Alex: see entire chapter 'Denying Evidence'

Grotum, Thomas: 107
Grubach, Paul: 20, 31
Gubała, Wojciech: 46, 48, 57, 63, 349
Guillaume, Pierre: 203
Gutman, Yisrael: 79, 95, 156, 181, 228, 230, 311, 349

— **H** —

Haber, Fritz: 41
Häberle, Wolfgang: 31
Hähnle, Otto: 78
Harris, Whitney: 293
Harwood, Richard: 257
Hausner, Gideon: 35
Henschler, Dietrich: 37
Herrmann, Hajo: 28
Hertzberg, Arthur: 199
Heydrich, Reinhard: 258f., 264
Hilberg, Raul: 245f., 264
Himmler, Heinrich: 95, 158, 209, 231f., 242, 250f., 261-265, 293-296
Hitler, Adolf: 62-66, 84, 111, 116, 209, 247f., 251-258, 261-266, 284
Hoffman, Michael A.: 203
Höfle, Hermann J.: 261
Hofstetter, Pierre: 210
Holbus, Jan: 11
Höss, Rudolf: 8, 24, 32, 93f., 100, 122, 172, 180, 220-224, 232, 261f., 276f., 283f., 290-298, 303, 305, 309, 310, 314, 315, 343, 361, 364
Höttl, Wilhelm: 209, 244

— **I** —

Irmscher, Richard: 37, 78
Irving, David: 16, 84, 114, 195, 198, 203, 205, 256, 258, 264, 280, 283, 313, 366f., 373, 376

— **J** —

Jaari, Sender: 293
Jährling, Rudolf: 118, 148
Jakobschötter, Rudolf: 100, 102, 142-146
Jankowski, Stanisław: 208, 343
Jenner, Judith: 89
Jesse, Eckhard: 15
Jochmann, Werner: 264
Josten, Heinrich: 313, 342, 344
Jothann, Werner: 113f., 227, 342, 344, 370

— K —

Kammerer, Rüdiger: 31, 46, 69, 74, 77, 214, 282, 306
Kammler, Hans: 95, 122, 153, 158, 188f., 218, 296, 300, 370, 377
Keller, Hans: 144, 174
Kellerhoff, Sven F.: 270, 279-281
Kempner, Robert M.: 247
Keren, Daniel: 190-194, 225, 281, 348, 360, 364-366, 373, 376, 380-382, 385, 389, 394
Kermisz, Józef: 260
Kessler, Richard: 93, 105, 133f., 151
Kielar, Wiesław: 160
Kirschneck, Hans: 117
Klarsfeld, Beate: 247
Klarsfeld, Serge: 23f., 247
Klein, Hans Heiko: 20
Kniesmeyer, Joke: 35
Koch, Wilhelm: 138
Kogon, Eugen: 35, 39, 42, 164, 206, 295
Kolowca, Stanisław: 309, 319
Korherr, Richard: 35, 246
Krakowski, Shmuel: 35
Kramer, Josef: 37f., 206, 289
Kraus, Ota: 283
Kremer, Johann Paul: 222f.
Krumme, Werner: 283
Kula, Michał: 79, 208, 303-306, 309-311, 314f., 332, 361-364, 369, 372-374, 379f.
Kulaszka, Barbara: 198, 291
Kulka, Erich: 283
Kywitz, Walter: 305

— L —

Łabędź, Jerzy: 46, 48, 57, 63, 349
Lambrecht, Wolfgang: 37
Langbein, Hermann: 32, 35, 164, 206, 220, 295
Legacé, Ivan: 99
Lehner, Dieter: 30
Lenzer: 236
Leski, Krzysztof: 269
Leuchter, Fred A.: 15-18, 23, 31, 34, 38-42, 45-52, 58, 67-70, 75, 80, 99-102, 195, 198, 214, 216, 233, 282, 350
Lewental, Salmen: 283
Lindsey, William: 203
Lingens Reiner, Ella: 107
Lipstadt, Deborah E.: 18, 69, 195, 198, 200, 205, 283, 313, 376

Lucas, Carroll: 170, 174, 181f., 367-370
Luczko, Stanisław: 345, 356
Ludwig, Karl: 193
Lüftl, Walter: 70, 81

— **M** —

Maccone, Luigi: 101
Manvell, R.: 259
Marais, Pierre: 203
Markiewicz, Jan: 84f., 349, see entire chapter 'Polish Pseudo-Scientists'
Maršálek, Hans: 35, 104, 132, 164, 239, 240, 242
Marszałek, Józef: 239
Mattogno, Carlo: 14, 18, 19, 20, 25-28, 30, 31, 34, 36, 41, 74, 76, 79-82, 87-94, 97, 99, 103f., 108-112, 116, 119, 122f., 129, 144, 148, 154-157, 164f., 169-171, 175f., 179-188, 195, 200, 207f., 213, 222, 227, 230-237, 240, 243, 249, 251, 256, 259, 262, 270, 271-275, 276, 280, 281-283, 285, 286, 289, 320, 323-341, 348, 355-359, 378, 391-393
Mazal, Harry W.: 225, 281, 348, 360, 373, 376, 380, 394
McCarthy, Jamie: 71, 225, 281, 348, 360, 373, 376, 380, 394
Meinecke, Albert: 17
Mencel, Tadeusz: 234
Mengele, Josef: 207f., 227, 287
Messing, Heinrich: 301, 303
Meyer, Fritjof: 19, 222, 269-271, 275f., 279
Moeschlin, Sven: 37
Moll, Otto: 175, 176
Moorehead, Alan: 9
Morawa, Mięcysław: 96, 109
Morgen, Konrad: 160, 283-286
Morris, Errol: 195, 198
Mossman, Allen L.: 197
Müller, Filip: 90, 175-179, 187, 207, 228, 231, 283, 290, 343

— **N** —

Naumann: 141
Neugebauer, Wolfgang: 16
Neuhäusler, Johann: 162f., 242
Newman, Robert J.: 211
Niznansky, Ladislav: 10
Nolte, Ernst: 18f.
Nowak, Hans Jürgen: 203
Nyiszli, Miklos: 170, 206-208, 228, 283, 287-290, 363, 369

— **O** —

O'Keefe, Theodore J.: 8, 203

Ochshorn, Egon: 283
Oleksy, Krystyna: 218

— **P** —

Paisikovic, Dov: 208
Parcer, Jan: 107
Pauly, Max: 147
Pelt, Robert J. van: 16, 19f., 28, 79, 84, 89, 114, 158, 195, 198, 205, 208, 217, 298f., 302, 313f., 366, 373, 376
Perl, Lt.: 9f.
Perry, J.H.: 27
Peters, Gerhard: 29, 36
Peterson, Agnes F.: 263
Philips, Raymond: 206, 228, 289
Phlishko, Lemke: 362
Picker, Henry: 253, 264
Pingel, Falk: 35
Pini, G.: 101
Piper, Franciszek: 89, 156, 181f., 217, 228, 230, 245, 270, 311, 349
Pisanty, Valentina: 200
Pohl, Oswald: 285, 342
Poirier, Robert: 291
Polevoi, Boris: 208
Poliakov, Léon: 208, 211
Pollock, Josef: 153
Postel-Vinay, Anise: 35
Pressac, Jean-Claude: 63, 79, 89-91, 94-100, 109f., 113, 119-121, 135, 153, 155, 157, 159, 166, 167, 171, 174, 175, 177, 184, 188, 190, 206, 214f., 218-222, 224-230, 233, 269, 272, 273f., 285, 286, 287f., 295-302, 303, 307-310, 311, 312, 326f., 332, 342, 345-351, 361, 363, 364, 365f., 369, 371, 375-378, 394, see entire chapter 'Pressac: From Paul to Pseudo-Saul'
Provan, Charles D.: 225, 280, 282-287, 289, 290-299, 302f., 306-312, 327-340, 360f., 365, 372-375, 385, 394
Prüfer, Kurt: 26, 93, 95, 98f., 110-112, 116-119, 129, 138, 149, 173, 177, 193, 273, 275, 300, 306
Puntigam, Franz: 36

— **R** —

Raab, Karola: 89
Rademacher, Werner: 27, 203
Rajca, Czesław: 234
Rassinier, Paul: 31, 62, 202, 209
Reitlinger, Gerald: 206, 218, 246
Remer, Otto Ernst: 33, 70

Renk, Brian: 203
Reuters, Fritz: 261
Robel, Jan Z.: 310
Röbert, S.: 78
Roden, Edward L. van: 9
Roques, Henri: 203
Rosenberg, Alfred: 256
Ross, Jeffrey: 13
Rössler, Ulrich: 154, 156
Roth, James: 198, see entire chapter 'Professor Perjury'
Rückerl, Adalbert: 35, 164, 206, 295
Rudolf, Germar: 15-19, 20f., 23-31, 32f., 36f., 40, 46-49, 51, 57-59, 63, 69, 70-73, 74f., 76, 80, 81, 85, 88, 91, 93, 96, 99, 119, 121, 195, 196, 203, 213-215, 216, 220, 232, 237, 245, 263, 270, 277f., 280, 282f., 292, 298, 299, 302, 306, 308, 311, 350, 364
Rummel, Walter: 37
Rutkowski, Adam: 35

— S —

Sander, Fritz: 111, 306
Sanning, Walter N.: 203, 245
Schlachter, August: 141
Schläpfer, Paul: 125
Schnabel, Reimund: 96
Schultze, Karl: 104, 117, 283f., 290, 303, 306f., 311
Schuman, Prof.: 315
Schuster, Wolfgang: 31
Schwarz, L.: 197
Sehn, Jan: 45, 46f., 57, 63, 65, 77, 83f., 184, 309f., 314f., 375
Seibold, Eugen: 104
Shermer, Michael: 19, 74, see entire chapter 'Denying Evidence'
Simpson, Gordon: 9
Skalski, Ernest: 269
Smith, Bradley F.: 263
Smith, Bradley R.: 7f., 11f., 203, 217
Solms, Armin: 31, 46, 69, 74, 77, 214, 282, 306
Sommers, Ernest: 20
Speer, Albert: 139, 257
Spektor, Shmuel: 35
Springer, Elisa: 226, 227
Stäglich, Wilhelm: 203
Stark, Hans: 343
Strzelecki, A.: 230
Stuldreher, Coenraad: 35

Sułkowski, Czesław: 343
Sulzberger, Arthur: 12
Süssmuth, Rita: 270
Svoray, Yaaron: 211

— **T** —

Tauber, Henryk: 24-28, 32, 96, 119, 176f., 191, 208, 228, 246, 273, 283-286, 289f., 303, 305, 310, 313-315, 361-367, 377, 379
Tesch, Bruno: 221, 286
Thion, Serge: 23, 63, 203
Thompson, Henry: 147
Tiedemann, Markus: 18
Tillion, Germaine: 35
Tilly, H.: 145
Toben, Fredrick: 311
Tregenza, Michael: 233, 235, 238
Trombley, Stephen: 70
Trzcinska, Beata: 46

— **V** —

Verbeke, Herbert: 28
Vidal-Naquet, Pierre: 18, 200, 211, 220
Volckmann, Hans: 193
Vrba, Rudolf: 206, 208, 283

— **W** —

Walendy, Udo: 15, 203
Wandres, Thomas: 14
Waubke, Niels Valerian: 77
Weast, Robert C.: 197
Weber, Mark: 20, 31, 48, 69, 203, 211
Weckert, Ingrid: 37, 203
Wegner, Werner: 15, 16, 47
Weinisch, Theodor: 101
Weiss, Janda: 283
Wellers, Georges: 18, 200, 206, 246, see entire chapter 'Fantasies of a Biochemist'
Wellhöner, Hans-Herbert: 37
Wesche, Karlhans: 78
Wetzler, Alfred: 206, 208, 283
Wiesenfeld, Bavaria: 81
Willing, August: 133, 155
Wilson, Kenneth R.: 291
Wirth, Wolfgang: 37
Witte, Peter: 251

Witzsch, Hans-Jürgen: 17

Wolter, Fritz: 300f.

— Z —

Zeitschel, Carltheo: 256

Zimmerman, John C.: 200, 229, 279, 285f., 367, see entire chapters 'An Accountant Poses as Cremation Expert' and 'The International Auschwitz Controversy'

Zimmermann, Günter: 49, 61, 81

Zitelmann, Rainer: 15

Żłobnicki, Adam: 345, 347

Zündel, Ernst: 195, 198, 203, 291

[1] Bradley R. Smith, "The Holocaust Story: How Much is False? The Case for Open Debate" www.vho.org/GB/c/BRS/adscasefor.html; updated: www.vho.org/Intro/GB/Flyer.html; also available as a flyer (download: www.vho.org/Intro/GB/Flyer.pdf; purchase: vho.org/store/USA/bresult.php?ID=87)

[2] "College Ads and the Holocaust," *Washington Post*, Dec. 21, 1991, A18.

[3] Bradley R. Smith, *Confessions of a Holocaust Revisionist*, Prima Facie, Los Angeles 1987; see also the review Theodore J. O'Keefe, *JHR* 8(1) (1988), pp. 110-113 (www.ihr.org/jhr/v08/v08p110_OKeefe.html).

[4] Bradley R. Smith, *Break His Bones*, published by author, San Ysidro 2003.

[5] R. Butler, *Legions of Death*, Arrows Books Ltd., London 1986, pp. 236f.; cf.: Robert Faurisson, "How the British Obtained the Confessions of Rudolf Höss," *JHR* 7(4) (1986), pp. 389-403.

[6] Alan Moorehead, "Belsen," in: Cyril Connolly (ed.), *The Golden Horizon*, Weidenfels and Nicholson, London 1953, pp. 105f.

[7] E.L. van Roden, "American Atrocities in Germany," *The Progressive*, February 1949, pp. 21f. (www.corax.org/revisionism/documents/19490200vanroden.html).

[8] German monthly magazine *Focus*, Feb. 9, 2004.

[9] "Ugly Ideas, and Democracy," *New York Times*, January 15, 1992.

[10] *ADL on the Frontline*, Anti-Defamation League, special summer edition 2003; cf. Bradley Smith, "Revisionist Notes," *The Revisionist* 1(4) (2003), pp. 364-366.

[11] *Die Auschwitz-Lüge*, Series *Kritik*, issue no. 23, Kritik Verlag, Mohrkirch 1973.

[12] See for example Thomas Wandres, *Die Strafbarkeit des Auschwitz-Leugnens*, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin 2000.

[13] G. Rudolf, *Auschwitz-Lügen*, Castle Hill Publishers, Hasting 2005 (www.vho.org/D/al).

[14] See now Fred A. Leuchter, Robert Faurisson, Germar Rudolf, *The Leuchter Reports. Critical Edition*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2005 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/tlr).

[15] Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz (ed.), *Rechtsextremistischer revisionismus. Ein Thema von heute*, Cologne 2002, p. 19, fn. 22 (on F. Leuchter) and p. 20, fn 24f. (on G. Rudolf), with reference to subsequently quoted works by Hellmuth Auerbach, Werner Wegner, and Josef Bailer.

[16] Hellmuth Auerbach, Institut für Zeitgeschichte, November 1989, published in: U. Walendy, *Historische Tatsachen* No. 42, Verlag für Volkstum und Zeitgeschichtsforschung, Vlotho 1990, p. 34. In an updated version published as "Leuchter-Report," in: Wolfgang Benz (ed.), *Legenden, Lügen, Vorurteile*, 7th ed., dtv, Munich 1995, pp. 147ff.; also as "Die Authentizität des 'Leuchter-Reports'," in: Der Bundesminister des Innern (ed.), *Aktuelle Aspekte des Rechtsextremismus*, Bonn 1994, pp. 101-104.

[17] See "Institut für Zeitlegenden" in G. Rudolf, op. cit. (note 13), pp. 15-28.

[18] W. Wegner, in: U. Backes, E. Jesse, R. Zitelmann (eds.), *Die Schatten der Vergangenheit*, Propyläen, Frankfurt/Main 1990, pp. 450-476 (www.vho.org/D/dsdv/Wegner.html, with inserted comments of mine).

[19] See "Ein Sozialoberrat schreibt Geschichte" in G. Rudolf, op. cit. (note 13), pp. 55-73.

[20] For instance, Robert J. van Pelt, *The Case for Auschwitz. Evidence from the Irving Trial*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington/Indianapolis 2002, p. 51, claiming that "Wegner amply demonstrated that Leuchter's science did not pass critical muster."

[21] J. Bailer, "Der Leuchter-Bericht aus der Sicht eines Chemikers," in: *Amoklauf gegen die Wirklichkeit*, Dokumentationszentrum des österreichischen Widerstandes, Bundesministerium für Unterricht und Kultur (eds.), Vienna 1991, pp. 47-52.

[22] As early as 1993: E. Gauss (alias G. Rudolf), *Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte*, Grabert, Tübingen 1993, pp. 290-293 (online: www.vho.org/D/vuez); Gauss, "Chemische Wissenschaft zur Gaskammerfrage," *Deutschland in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 41(2) (1993), pp. 16-24 (online: vho.org/D/DGG/Gauss41_2);

[23] J. Bailer, "Die 'Revisionisten' und die Chemie," Brigitte Bailer-Galanda, Wolfgang Benz und Wolfgang Neugebauer (ed.), *Wahrheit und Auschwitzlüge*, Deuticke, Wien 1995, pp. 99-118; also in B. Bailer-Galanda, W. Benz, W. Neugebauer (ed.), *Die Auschwitzleugner. 'Revisionistische' Geschichtslüge und historische Wahrheit*, Berlin 1996, pp. 130-152.

[24] See my updated critique: "Lüge und Auschwitz-Wahrheit" in G. Rudolf, op. cit. (note 13), pp. 189-231; a slightly older version of this paper is available in English online: "Critique of Truth and the Auschwitz-Lie" (online: www.vho.org/GB/Books/cq/critique.html); see also my deliberations in *The Rudolf Report*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003, pp. 211f., 248f., 269f.

[25] German daily newspapers, for instance: *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, *Stuttgarter Zeitung*, *Südwestpresse-Verbund* (March 29, 1994), *taz*, *Frankfurter Rundschau* (March 30, 1994).

[26] G. Rudolf, "Über die frei erfundene Expertenmeinung der 'dpa'," *Deutschland in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 42(2) (1994), pp. 25f. (online: www.vho.org/D/DGG/Rudolf42_2.html); Engl. in G. Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report*, op. cit. (note 24), pp. 385-387. Updated German version as "Fälscherwerkstatt dpa" in G. Rudolf, op. cit. (note 13), pp. 117-130.

[27] So for instance by the South African newspaper *The Citizen*, June 24, 1995, p. 8.

[28] See the Bavarian State Ministry for the Interior, *Verfassungsschutzbericht* 1997, Munich 1998, p. 64. A corresponding reference to the factual incorrectness of the remarks made in this regard by the *Arbeitskreis Zeitgeschichte und Politik* (in a letter by president Hans-Jürgen Witzsch, dated Oct. 8, 1998, Fürth) was countered by the Ministry as follows: "Your efforts to deny and/or relativize the crimes of the National Socialists have been known to the security authorities for years. [...] We see no occasion for a discussion of gas chambers." The letter, from Dr. Weber of the Bavarian State Ministry of the Interior dated Oct. 13, 1998, ref. IF1-1335.31-1, probably established a new world record for stupidity.

[29] "Die Auschwitz-Lügen," *Die Zeit*, Sept. 18, 1992, p. 104; "Der 'Leuchter-Report,'" *ibid.*, Sept. 25, 1992, p. 90. The articles were completely reproduced in G. Rudolf, op. cit. (note 13), pp. 75-83.

[30] See "Die Zeit lügt!" in G. Rudolf, op. cit. (note 13), pp. 75-116.

[31] *Auschwitz und die „Auschwitz-Lüge.“ Massenmord und Geschichtsfälschung*, Beck, Munich 1994, 102 pp; 5th ed., *ibid.*, 1997, 108pp. The book also appeared in Italian: *Auschwitz e la "menzogna su Auschwitz." Sterminio di massa e falsificazione della storia*, Bollati Boringhieri, Torino 1995; see also Carlo Mattogno's response: "Till Bastian e la 'Menzogna su Auschwitz,'" Carlo Mattogno, *Olocausto: Dilettanti allo sbaraglio. Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Georges Wellers, Deborah Lipstadt, Till Bastian, Florent Brayard et alii contro il revisionismo storico*, Padova, Edizioni di Ar, 1996 (www.vho.org/aaargh/ital/archimatto/CMDi4.html).

[32] Markus Tiedemann, "In Auschwitz wurde niemand vergast." 60 *rechtsradikale Lügen und wie man sie widerlegt*, Verlag an der Ruhr, Mülheim 1996; it was positively reviewed by Germany's most respected daily newspaper *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Jan. 15, 1997.

[33] See "In Auschwitz wurde niemand vergast" in G. Rudolf, op. cit. (note 13), pp. 261-282.

[34] Goldmann, Munich, and Omnibus, Munich.

[35] Rather: the SPD's fund raising organization and think tank Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

[36] Ernst Nolte, *Streitpunkte. Heutige und künftige Kontroversen um den*

Nationalsozialismus, Propyläen, Berlin 1993.

[37] For some excerpts of Nolte's statements in this and in other books see G. Rudolf, *Lectures on the Holocaust*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2005, chapter 2.15. (www.vho.org/GB/Books/loth).

[38] Ernst Nolte, *Der kausale Nexus*, Herbig, Munich 2002, pp. 96f., 122

[39] See "Im Streit mit Professor Nolte" in G. Rudolf, op. cit. (note 13), pp. 131-187.

[40] C. Mattogno, "Auschwitz 1270 to the Present" (www.vho.org/GB/c/CM/irving-eng.html); G. Rudolf, "Critique of Claims Made by Robert Jan Van Pelt" (vho.org/GB/c/GR/RudolfOnVanPelt.html); "Critique of the 'Findings on Justification' by Judge Gray" (vho.org/GB/c/GR/CritiqueGray.html); Ernest Sommers, "Holocaust Orthodoxy: The Road Paved with Moral Certainty," *The Revisionist*, Codoh series, No. 3, 2000.

[41] Robert Jan van Pelt, op. cit. (note 20); for partial reviews see: Samuel Crowell, *The Revisionist*, Codoh series, No. 4, 2002; Robert H. Countess, "Van Pelt's Plea against Sound Reasoning," *The Revisionist* 1(1) (2003), 99-104; Paul Grubach, "World War I Atrocity Propaganda and the Holocaust," *The Revisionist* 1(1) (2003), pp. 104-109.

[42] Germar Rudolf, Carlo Mattogno, *Auschwitz: The Case against Insanity*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2005 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/atcai) in preparation.

[43] Bundesamt für Verfassungsschutz (ed.), op. cit. (note 15), p. 21.

[44] Germar Rudolf, "Von der Angst und wie man sie überwindet," *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, 4(2) (2000), pp. 122-124.

[45] For the reaction of European media to Pressac see, e.g., for Germany Germar Rudolf, "Pressac and the German Public," in: Germar Rudolf (ed.), *Auschwitz: Plain Facts*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2005, pp. 21-35 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/apf); for France: Serge Thion, "History by Night or in Fog?," *ibid.*, pp. 37-58.

[46] J.-C. Pressac, *Jour J*, December 12, 1988, pp. I-X.

[47] R. Faurisson, *Journal of Historical Review*, 11(1) (1991), pp. 25-66; *ibid.*, 11(2) (1991), pp. 133-175; Faurisson, in Germar Rudolf (ed.), op. cit. (note 1), pp. 59-116.

[48] Interrogation of Henryk Tauber on May 25, 1945, appendix 18, vol. 11 of the Höss trial, quoted acc. to J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, New York 1989, pp. 481-502 (<http://holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/pressac/technique-and-operation/pressac0011.shtml>).

[49] For more detailed arguments about the following see G. Rudolf, *Lectures on the Holocaust*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2005, Chapter 4.5.6. (www.vho.org/GB/Books/loth).

- [50] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 4), p. 489.
- [51] Cf. C. Mattogno, "Flames and Smoke from the Chimneys of Crematoria," *The Revisionist*, 2(1) (2004), pp. 73-78.
- [52] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 4), p. 495.
- [53] Ibid., p. 114.
- [54] Ibid., p. 259, section enlargement.
- [55] Penal matter no. 1719, interrogation of Kurt Prüfer by the KGB in Moscow, March 19, 1946, Archive of the *Federal Security Service of the Russian Federation* (Federalnaya Slushba Besopasnosti Rossiskoy Federatsiy), N-19262; see J. Graf, "Anatomie der sowjetischen Befragung der Topf-Ingenieure," *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* 6(4) (2002), PP. 398-421, here p. 407.
- [56] C. Mattogno, "The Crematoria Ovens of Auschwitz and Birkenau," in: Germar Rudolf (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust*, 2nd ed., Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2003, pp. 281-320, here p. 403 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/dth).
- [57] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 4), pp. 489, 495.
- [58] Ibid., pp. 500f.
- [59] Ibid., p. 494.
- [60] Michael Gärtner, Werner Rademacher, "Ground Water in the Area of the POW camp Birkenau," *The Revisionist*, 1(1) (2003), pp. 3-12; Carlo Mattogno, "'Incineration Pits' and Ground Water Level in Birkenau," *ibid.*, pp. 13-16 (www.vho.org/tr/2003/1/Mattogno13-16.html).
- [61] J.H. Perry, *Chemical Engineer's Handbook*, Wilmington Delaware 1949, p. 1584.
- [62] See the German version of op. cit. (note 1): Herbert Verbeke (ed.), *Auschwitz: Nackte Fakten*, VHO, Berchem 1996 (www.vho.org/D/anf/); see also the critique of the work by R. van Pelt, most of which applies to Pressac as well: Germar Rudolf, Carlo Mattogno, *Auschwitz: The Case against Insanity*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, in preparation (www.vho.org/GB/Books/atcai).
- [63] CNRS Éditions, Paris 1993.
- [64] There are two exceptions to this, but their context actually underlines my accusation: In *Les Crématoires...* he gives the boiling point of hydrogen cyanide (p. 16), but confuses it with an "evaporation point," which does not exist. With this statement he merely proves his physico-chemical incompetence. He mentions another source about the circulation delousing devices, but only because he found it in a Moscow archive. He does not discuss the content of this document (p. 41).
- [65] Since it was revealed that the alleged WWII service ID card of John Demjanjuk had been forged by the KGB, it should be self-evident that it is pivotal to subject documents coming from these archives to criticism. See Dieter Lehner, *Du sollst nicht falsch Zeugnis geben*, Vowinkel, Berg, undated.
- [66] Cf. the many examples quoted by R. Faurisson, op. cit. (note 3), and Carlo

Mattogno, in G. Rudolf (ed.), op. cit. (note 1), pp. 117-170.

[67] See beside R. Faurisson, op. cit., (note 3) also W. Häberle, *Deutschland in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 39(2) (1991) pp. 13-17.

(www.vho.org/D/DGG/Haeberle39_2.html); W. Schuster, *ibid.*, pp. 9-13.

(vho.org/D/DGG/Schuster39_2.html); M. Weber, "Fred Leuchter: Courageous Defender of Historical Truth," *Journal of Historical Review* 12(4) (1992-93) pp. 421-428

(www.vho.org/GB/Journals/JHR/12/4/Weber421-428.html); P. Grubach, "The Leuchter Report Vindicated," *ebenda*, S. 445-473 (~/Grubach445-473.html); E. Gauss (=G.

Rudolf), "Chemische Wissenschaft zur Gaskammerfrage," *Deutschland in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 41(2) (1993) pp. 16-24 (www.vho.org/D/DGG/Gauss41_2); Gauss,

Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte, Grabert, Tübingen 1993 (www.vho.org/D/vuez).

[68] Cf. R. Kammerer, A. Solms, *Das Rudolf Gutachten*, Cromwell, London 1993, esp. pp. 22-29 (vho.org/D/rga1/rga.html); see also C. Mattogno's contribution "The Elusive Holes of Death" starting on p. 279 of this book.

[69] *Ibid.*; Engl.: Germar Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/trr).

[70] For instance, in *Les Crématoires* Pressac quotes the statement by Pery S. Broad (p. 22), Rudolf Höss (pp. 51, 61, 73, 74, 98, 103), Henryk Tauber (pp. 85, 93), and frequently quotes witness statements from Danuta Czech's book *Kalendarium der Ereignisse von Auschwitz-Birkenau 1939-1945*, Rowohlt, Reinbek 1989 (pp. 41f., 49, 54, 95, 98, 121, 192-202), as well as Hermann Langbein's book *Der Auschwitz-Prozeß*, Europa Verlag, Vienna 1965 (p. 117), which is riddled with witness statements.

[71] Cf. Jürgen Graf, "In Memoriam Jean-Claude Pressac," *The Revisionist* 7(4) (2003), pp. 426-432.

[72] C. Mattogno, "My Memories of Jean-Claude Pressac," *ibid.*, pp. 432-435.

[73] Robert Faurisson, "My Revisionist Method," *Journal of Historical Review* 21(2) (2002), pp. 7-14 (www.ihr.org/jhr/v21/v21n2p-7_faurisson.html).

[74] E.g.: *L'Etoile jaune à l'heure de Vichy/De Drancy à Auschwitz*, Fayard, 1973; "Die Zahl der Opfer der 'Endlösung' und der Korherr-Bericht," *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, 28(30) (1978) pp. 22-39; *La Solution Finale et la Mythomanie Néo-Nazie*, Klarsfeld, Paris 1979; "Essai de détermination du nombre des morts au camp d'Auschwitz," *Le Monde juif*, October-December 1983, pp. 127-159; "A propos du nombre de morts au camp d'Auschwitz," *Le Monde juif*, Oktober-Dezember 1990, pp. 187-195.

[75] Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein, Adalbert Rückerl, Yitzhak Arad, Wolfgang Benz, Fritz Bringmann, Pierre-Serge Choumoff, Barbara Distel, Willi Dreßen, Krzysztof Dunin-Wasoswicz, Jean-Pierre Faye, Nobert Frei, Jean Gavard, Gideon Hausner, Joke Kniesmeyer, Shmuel Krakowski, Hans Maršálek, Falk Pingel, Anise Postel-Vinay, Adam Rutkowski, Shmuel Spektor, Coenraad Stuldreher, Germaine Tillion, Georges Wellers.

[76] E. Kogon, H. Langbein, A. Rückerl et al. (ed.), *Nationalsozialistische*

Massentötungen durch Giftgas, S. Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt 1983, from which I quoted a phrase from the introduction. The introduction to the English edition is less dogmatic: “our intention to set down, in a precise and indisputable manner, the historical truth about the massacres perpetrated by means of poison gas during this period,” *Nazi Mass Murder*, Yale University Press, New Haven 1993, p. 2. I quote from the original German edition in the following.

[77] Ibid., German ed., pp. 194-239, 281-287; Engl. ed.: pp. 139-173, 205-209.

[78] His only reference to such a source is an article by F. Puntigam, H. Breymesser, E. Bernfus, *Blausäuregaskammern zur Fleckfieberabwehr*, Sonderveröffentlichung des Reichsarbeitsblattes, Berlin 1943, but merely to indicate that Gerhard Peters, at that time CEO of the company producing Zyklon B (DEGESCH), had compared the toxicity of hydrogen cyanide with other chemicals.

[79] After the embarrassingly absurd testimonies had been mucked out, cf. in this regard Carlo Mattogno, Jürgen Graf, *Treblinka. Extermination Camp or Transit Camp?*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2004 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/t); Carlo Mattogno, *Belzec in Propaganda, Testimonies, Archeological Research, and History*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2004 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/b).

[80] Cf. F.P. Berg, “The Diesel Gas Chambers: Myth Within A Myth,” *Journal of Historical Review* 5 (1), 1984, pp. 15-46 (www.vho.org/GB/Journals/JHR/5/1/Berg15-46.html); updated: “The Diesel Gas Chambers: Ideal for Torture – Absurd for Murder,” in: G. Rudolf (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust*, 2nd ed., Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2003, pp. 435-469; (www.vho.org/GB/Books/dth).

[81] Cf. in this regard I. Weckert, “The Gas Vans: A Critical Assessment of the Evidence,” in: G. Rudolf (ed.), *ibid*, pp. 215-241.

[82] The product based on diatomaceous earth as carrier material, as mentioned by Wellers (p. 282), was replaced at the end of the 1930s with a product using gypsum with some starch as a carrier (Ercco).

[83] Cf. R. Irmscher, “Nochmals: ‘Die Einsatzfähigkeit der Blausäure bei tiefen Temperaturen,’” *Zeitschrift für hygienische Zoologie und Schädlingsbekämpfung*, 34 (1942), pp. 35f. Cf. also Wolfgang Lambrecht, “Zyklon B – eine Ergänzung,” *VffG* 1(1) (1997), pp. 2-5.

[84] The cyanid is bound to body-own sulfur and converted to, and excreted as, non-toxic thiocyanide. W. Wirth, C. Gloxhuber, *Toxikologie*, Georg Thieme Verlag, Stuttgart 1985, pp. 159f.; W. Forth, D. Henschler, W. Rummel, *Allgemeine und spezielle Pharmakologie und Toxikologie*, Wissenschaftsverlag, Mannheim 1987, pp. 751f.; S. Moeschlin, *Klinik und Therapie der Vergiftung*, Georg Thieme Verlag, Stuttgart 1986, p. 300; H.-H. Wellhöner, *Allgemeine und systematische Pharmakologie und Toxikologie*, Springer Verlag, Berlin 1988, p. 445f. Although the equilibrium of the reaction of cyanide with the breathing enzyme is far on the side of the cyanide-cytochrom oxidase complex, it is not irreversible.

[85] Cf. Montgomery Belgion, *Victor’s Justice*, Regnery, Hinsdale, IL, 1949,

pp. 80f., 90.

[86] Even in half-concentrated sulfuric acid as used during U.S. executions, which is 10,000 times stronger than citric acid, some 50% of the hydrogen cyanide remain dissolved in the aqueous acid solution, as my own experiments have shown.

[87] G. Wellers, "A propos du 'rapport Leuchter' les chambres à gaz d'Auschwitz," *Le Monde Juif*, No. 134, April-Juni 1989, pp. 45-53; I have quoted from the German version: "Der Leuchter-Bericht über die Gaskammern von Auschwitz," *Dachauer Hefte*, 7(7) (November 1991), pp. 230-241.

[88] Fred A. Leuchter, *An Engineering Report on the alleged Execution Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland*, Samisdat Publishers, Toronto 1988 (www.zundelsite.org/english/leuchter/report1/leuchter.toc.html).

[89] Op. cit. (note 14), p. 231.

[90] With reference to his first book *Les chambres à gaz ont existé*, Gallimard, Paris 1981, pp. 137ff., as well as the above mentioned passages from E. Kogon et al., op. cit. (note 3) pp. 285f.

[91] Cf. G. Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2004, pp. 249, 254f. (vho.org/GB/Books/trr).

[92] Ibid., pp. 208-216.

[93] Ibid., note 469, p. 211: 5-12 kg per gassing of 1,000-2,000 victims, with a lethal concentration of 70 mg per person.

[94] Ibid., note 465, pp. 208f.

[95] Ibid., pp. 11f.

[96] C. Mattogno, *Olocausto: dilettanti allo sbaraglio*, Edizioni di Ar, Padua 1996, pp. 181-189, based on: Michele Giua, Clara Giua-Lollini, *Dizionario di chimica generale e industriale*, Unione Tipografico Editrice Torinese, Torino 1948, vol. I, pp. 312f.

[97] Ibid., pp. 211-216.

[98] Fred A. Leuchter, *An Engineering Report on the alleged Execution Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland*, Samisdat Publishers, Toronto 1988 (www.zundelsite.org/english/leuchter/report1/leuchter.toc.html).

[99] R. Kammerer, A. Solms, *Das Rudolf Gutachten*, Cromwell, London 1993 (vho.org/D/rga1/rga.html), p. 82.

[100] J. Markiewicz, W. Gubala, J. Łabędź, B. Trzcinska, *Expert Report*, Prof. Dr. Jan Sehn Institute for Forensic Research, department for toxicology, Krakow, Sept. 24, 1990; partially published, e.g. in: "An official Polish report on the Auschwitz 'gas chambers'," *Journal of Historical Review*, 11(2) (1991), pp. 207-216 (online: www.vho.org/GB/Journals/JHR/11/2/IHR207-216.html).

[101] Ibid.; I use my own translation here.

[102] Germar Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003, pp. 170-180 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/trr).

- [103] Ibid., chapter 6.5.4.1. and note 349; actually, the water is responsible for the decomposition.
- [104] Ibid., chapter 6.6.
- [105] Cf. my exposure of the ridiculously incompetent geriatric social worker Werner Wegner in my article “Ein Sozialoberrat schreibt Geschichte” in: Germar Rudolf, *Auschwitz-Lügen*, Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings 2005, pp. 51-69 (www.vho.org/D/al).
- [106] Letter by Jan Sehn Institute for Forensic Reserach, department for toxicology, Krakow, to W. Wegner, undated (Winter 1991/92), illegible signature (probably Markiewicz), unpublished.
- [107] Letter to Mark Weber, June 7, 1991, *The Journal of Historical Review*, 11(2) (1991), pp. 207-216 (www.vho.org/GB/Journals/JHR/11/2/IHR207-216.html).
- [108] J. Markiewicz, W. Gubala, J. Łabędź, *Z Zagadnien Nauk Sadowych*, vol. XXX (1994) pp. 17-27 (www2.ca.nizkor.org/ftp.cgi/orgs/polish/institute-for-forensic-research/post-leuchter.report).
- [109] The analytical results of sample taken in Auschwitz by Leuchter and Rudolf were once again confirmed by John C. Ball, *The Ball Report*, Samisdat Publishers, Toronto 1993.
- [110] Ernst Gauss (=Germar Rudolf), *Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte*, Grabert, Tübingen 1993 (www.vho.org/D/vuez).
- [111] G. Zimmermann (ed.), *Bauschäden Sammlung*, vol. 4, Forum-Verlag, Stuttgart 1981, pp. 120f. (www.vho.org/D/gzz/17.html); Engl. as “Wood Preservation Through Fumigation With Hydrogen Cyanide: Blue Discoloration of Lime- and Cement-Based Interior Plaster” in: G. Rudolf, *Dissecting the Holocaust*, 2nd ed., Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2003, pp. 557-561.
- [112] J. Epstein, *Analytical Chemistry*, 19 (1947), pp. 272f.
- [113] *Alpha Analytical Laboratories*, Ashland, MA (Leuchter); *Institut Fresenius*, Taunusstein, Germany and *Institut für Umwelt- und Schadstoffanalytik*, Stuttgart, Germany (Rudolf).
- [114] Cf. my exposure of Dr. Bailer’s contortions in my article “Lüge und Auschwitz-Wahrheit” in G. Rudolf, op. cit. (note 8), pp. 185-227; see also in English online: “Critique of Truth and the Auschwitz-Lie” (online: www.vho.org/GB/Books/cq/critique.html) and in my expert report, op. cit. (note 5), pp. 211f., 248f., 269f.
- [115] Iron Blue is unstable in alkaline environments like on cement plaster and concrete, which is why it is never used in wall paint. Its use on such walls would result in patchy blue discolorations.
- [116] First published in the small Berlin periodical *Sleipnir*, issue 3, 1995, pp. 29-33.
- [117] Deceptive dialectics: No one ever disputed that all kinds of cyanides develop in addition to Iron Blue, but fact is that after 50 years of exposure to the

environment Iron Blue as the most long-term stable compound must be expected to be the majority cyanide compound.

[118] E. Gauss, *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*, Grabert, Tübingen 1994; Engl: G. Rudolf (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust*, 2nd ed., Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2003.

[119] Considering the general lack of competence, maybe the samples without any traces of cyanide taken by the Poles from a delousing chamber were actually taken from walls that were added after the chamber was no longer used for Zyklon B disinfestation, as was the case for some internal walls in building BW5a. Samples from these walls do not have any significant cyanide residue, see my samples #10, 21, op. cit. (note 5), pp. 254-257.

[120] G. Zimmermann (ed.), op. cit. (note 14), as well as personal communications of Konrad Fischer, Hochstadt upon Main.

[121] Dokumentationszentrum des österreichischen Widerstandes, Bundesministerium für Unterricht und Kultur (eds.), *Amoklauf gegen die Wirklichkeit*, Vienna 1991.

[122] J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, New York 1989 (<http://holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/pressac/technique-and-operation/pressac0011.shtml>); Pressac, *Les crématoires d'Auschwitz. La machinerie du meurtre de masse*, CNRS Editions, Paris 1993.

[123] E. Gauss, op. cit. (note 13), pp. 163-170; 290-294.

[124] Arthur R. Butz, "Historical Past vs. Political Present," *Journal of Historical Review*, 19(6) (2000), pp. 12ff. (online: www.ihr.org/jhr/v19/v19n6p12_Butz.html).

[125] Richard J. Green, "The Chemistry of Auschwitz," May 10, 1998, online: holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/chemistry/, and "Leuchter, Rudolf and the Iron Blues," Feb. 25, 1998, online: holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/chemistry/blue/. Because the second article is rather superficial, I focus my attention on the first.

[126] Fred A. Leuchter, *An Engineering Report on the alleged Execution Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland*, Samisdat Publishers, Toronto 1988 (www.zundelsite.org/english/leuchter/report1/leuchter.toc.html).

[127] Rüdiger Kammerer, Armin Solms (eds.), *Das Rudolf Gutachten*, Comwell Press, London 1993 (www.vho.org/D/rga1); revised: Germar Rudolf, *Das Rudolf Gutachten*, 2nd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings 2001 (www.vho.org/D/rga2); Engl.: Germar Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/trr).

[128] Deborah E. Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*, Free Press, New York 1993.

[129] Engineering Board of Massachusetts had accused Leuchter to have used the title "engineer" unjustly. The court dealing with the case refused to admit the case

and forced the two parties to come to a settlement, in which Leuchter agreed “to do none of the things that he never did in the first place and not to recant or change anything he ever did or said, in return for the board’s dropping of the complaint,” cf. Leuchter’s letter dated April 5, 1999 (www.vho.org/GB/c/DI/Shallit.html); see also Fred A. Leuchter, “Witch Hunt in Boston,” *Journal of Historical Review* 10(4) (1990), pp. 453-460 (www.vho.org/GB/Journals/JHR/10/4/Leuchter453-460.html); Mark Weber, “Probing Look at ‘Capital Punishment Industry’ Affirms Expertise of Auschwitz Investigator Leuchter,” *Journal of Historical Review* 17(2) (1998), pp. 34ff.; cf. also Stephen Trombley, *The Execution Protocol*, Crown Publishers, New York 1992.

[130] Cf. in this regard G. Rudolf, “Discovering Absurdistan,” *The Revisionist* 1(2) (2003), p. 203-219.

[131] www.holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/chemistry/not-the-science/. This article was co-authored by Jamie McCarthy. Because it cannot be recognized, which statement was made by which author, I subsequently only address Dr. Green.

[132] www.vho.org/GB/c/GR/CharacterAssassins.html.

[133] In the first edition of this book I wrote in this footnote: “This is an unproven hypothesis, which I use as an example only in order to illustrate the way Green behaves toward me. Although both are possible, it does not contribute anything to the factual controversy, so that I will not waste my time to do research on this.” Well, it turns out that Green is actually a Jew; see his polemic exchange with A.S. Marques, www.codoh.com/newrevoices/nrmarques/nrmgreen.html, where he stated in the mid 1990s: “Liar, I am a Jew and I receive no reparations.”

[134] www.holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/chemistry/not-the-science/postscript.shtml

[135] Richard J. Green, “Postscript to Chemistry is not the Science: Rudolf’s Character Suicide,” July 2000, www.holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/chemistry/not-the-science/postscript.shtml

[136] Robert Faurisson, Letter to the Editor, *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* 7(1) (2003), pp. 116.

[137] Michael Shermer, *Why People Believe Weird Things*, Freeman & Co. New York 1997; cf. in this regard C. Mattogno, “Denying Evidence” in this volume.

[138] R. Kammerer, A. Solms, op. cit. (note 3), pp. 22-29; see also the 2nd German ed., op. cit. (note 3), pp. 78-93; and G. Rudolf, “Das Rudolf Gutachten in der Kritik, Teil 2,” *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* 3(1) (1999), S. 77-82.

[139] See C. Mattogno’s contribution “The Elusive Holes of Death” to the present book, starting at p. 279.

[140] First time: Josef Bailer, “Der Leuchter-Bericht aus der Sicht eines Chemikers,” in: *Amoklauf gegen die Wirklichkeit*, Dokumentationszentrum des österreichischen Widerstandes, Bundesministerium für Unterricht und Kultur (eds.), Vienna 1991, pp. 47-52; see my remarks in the introduction to the present book, pp. 16f.

[141] Regarding the mechanism cf. *The Rudolf Report*, op. cit. (note 1), pp.

159-170, 180-189.

[142] Cf. *The Rudolf Report*, op. cit. (note 3); G. Rudolf (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust*, 2nd ed., Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/dth); C. Mattogno, J. Graf, *Concentration Camp Majdanek*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/ccm); C. Mattogno, J. Graf, *Concentration Camp Stutthof*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/ccs).

[143] Cf. my expert report, Engl. edition, op. cit. (note 3), pp. 165, 168f., which were already included in the first German edition, op. cit. (note 3), pp. 42, 44.

[144] N.V. Waubke, *Transportphänomene in Betonporen*, Dissertation, Braunschweig 1966; cf. 1st German ed., R. Kammerer, A. Solms (ed.), op. cit. (note 3), chapter 2.5.2., pp. 50f.; Engl. ed., op. cit. (note 3), pp. 181f.

[145] S. Röbert (ed.), *Systematische Baustofflehre*, 4th ed., VEB Verlag für Bauwesen, Berlin 1983; K. Wesche, *Baustoffe für tragende Bauteile*, Bauverlag, Wiesbaden 1977; Verein Deutscher Zementwerke, *Zement Taschenbuch 1972/73*, Bauverlag, Wiesbaden 1972; W. Czernin, *Zementchemie für Bauingenieure*, Bauverlag, Wiesbaden 1977; W.H. Duda, *Cement-Data-Book*, Bauverlag, Wiesbaden 1976; O. Hähnle (ed.), *Baustoff-Lexikon*, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, Stuttgart 1961.

[146] Cf. R. Irmscher, "Nochmals: 'Die Einsatzfähigkeit der Blausäure bei tiefen Temperaturen'," *Zeitschrift für hygienische Zoologie und Schädlingsbekämpfung*, 34 (1942), pp. 35f.

[147] Cf. Conrad Grieb, "Der selbstassistierte Holocaust-Schwindel," *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* 1(1) (1997), pp. 6-8 (Engl.: "The Self-assisted Holocaust Hoax," www.vho.org/GB/c/FPB/SelfAssisted.html).

[148] Cf. in this regard my expert report, Engl. ed., op. cit. (note 3), pp. 223-227.

[149] Cf. about this C. Mattogno's article "The Elusive Holes of Death" in this volume.

[150] The wrong capacity given by Green falsch is based on a false and unfounded by J.-C. Pressac, together with Robert van Pelt, in: Israel Gutman, Michael Berenbaum (eds.), *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington 1994, pp. 210, 232; cf. the Moscow documents RGVA 502-1-312, p. 69 and 502-1-312, pp. 65-68. The real capacity is given in invoices by the firm that delivered and installed the ventilation systems: Invoice no. 729, May 27, 1943. Archive of the State Museum of Auschwitz, D-Z/Bau, Nr. inw. 1967, pp. 246f.; *ibid.*, pp. 231f.: Invoice no. 171, Feb. 22, 1943 for crematory II. RGVA 502-1-327, pp. 25 + 25R; 502-1-327, pp. 16 + 16R. Reproduced and discussed in Carlo Mattogno, "Auschwitz: The End of a Legend," in: G. Rudolf (de.), *Auschwitz: Plain Facts*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2005, pp. 153-155. (www.vho.org/GB/Books/apf).

[151] With reference to the arguments listed in my expert report, Engl. ed., op. cit. (note 3), pp. 20-22, 151-155, 170-180.

- [152] In Ernst Gauss (ed.), *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*, Grabert, Tübingen 1994, pp. 401-404, based on an article discovered by Walter Lüftl: Günter Zimmermann (ed.), *Bauschäden Sammlung*, vol. 4, Forum-Verlag, Stuttgart 1981, pp. 120f.; Engl.: in G. Rudolf (ed.), op. cit. (note 18), pp. 557-561.
- [153] See the illustrations in C. Mattogno, J. Graf, *Concentration Camp Majdanek*, op. cit. (note 18); C. Mattogno, J. Graf, *Concentration Camp Stutthof*, op. cit. (note 18).
- [154] Cf. my article “Polish Pseudo-Scientists” in this volume.
- [155] Richard J. Green, “Report of Richard J. Green,” introduced in evidence during the libel case before the Queen’s Bench Division, Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London, David John Cawdell Irving vs. (1) Penguin Books Limited, (2) Deborah E. Lipstadt, ref. 1996 I. No. 1113, 2001, p. 18; www.holocaust-history.org/irving-david/rudolf/affweb.pdf.
- [156] Robert Jan van Pelt, *The Case for Auschwitz. Evidence from the Irving Trial*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington/Indianapolis 2002, pp. 391-398 (reference to Markiewicz et al.), 498 (reference to R. Green).
- [157] www.holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/body-disposal/
- [158] www.vho.org/GB/c/CM/jcz.html
- [159] www.holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/response-to-mattogno/
- [160] www.vho.org/GB/c/CM/Risposta-new-eng.html.
- [161] See C. Mattogno, “Memories about Russell Granata,” *The Revisionist* 2(4) (2004), pp. 442f.
- [162] J.C. Zimmerman, *Holocaust Denial. Demographics, Testimonies and Ideologies*, University Press of America, Lanham/New York/Oxford 2000.
- [163] www.vho.org/GB/Books/dth/fndcrema.html
- [164] Grabert Verlag, Tübingen 1994, pp. 281-320; an updated English version was published as C. Mattogno, “The Crematoria Ovens of Auschwitz and Birkenau,” in: Germar Rudolf (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust*, 2nd ed., Theses and Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2003, pp. 373-412 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/dth).
- [165] For this reason he is cited as co-author, although I alone wrote that article.
- [166] The planned year of release for that publication is 2005.
- [167] Documents cited here, except were indicated otherwise, are published and discussed in this book.
- [168] Granata Publishing, Palos Verdes 1995.
- [169] An online Internet version (www.vho.org/GB/c/CM/gcnewrev.html) includes these words, which had been added without the author’s consent: “The small column of smoke rising from the courtyard near Crematory V which appears in the aerial photographs of May 31, 1944 is consistent with outside trash incineration in an open-air container where lower level combustion air is able to enter; we know of no aerial photographic evidence of pit incineration where burning would have been very slow

because of poor air circulation.” Editor’s remark.

[170] Granata Publishing, Palos Verdes 1995.

[171] *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*. Institute for Historical Review, Newport Beach, CA, 1994, p. 72; more recent: C. Mattogno, “Auschwitz: The End of a Legend,” in: G. Rudolf (de.), *Auschwitz: Plain Facts*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2005, p. 161 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/apf).

[172] H. Fröhlich, “Zur Gesundheitspflege auf den Schlachtfeldern,” in: *Deutsche Militärärztliche Zeitschrift*, I, 1-4, Januar - April 1872, p. 101.

[173] Ibid., p. 100.

[174] Another factor no less important was the special structure of the Gusen oven muffle grill.

[175] C. Mattogno, *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, op. cit. (note 15), p. 23; in G. Rudolf (ed.), *ibid.*, p. 132.

[176] Auschwitz Museum Archive, BW 30/34, pp. 78f.

[177] Evidently for Zimmerman “*Häftlingsunterkünfte*” (inmate accommodation) is a code-word for “*Auskleidebaracken*” (undressing hut). The imagination of these people is limitless!

[178] “*Kostenanschlag für Bauvorhaben Konzentrationslager Auschwitz O/S*” dated July 15, 1942. RGVA, 502-1-220, p. 36.

[179] C. Mattogno, *Special Treatment in Auschwitz. Genesis and Meaning of a Term*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2004, p. 36 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/st).

[180] Danuta Czech, *Kalendarium der Ereignisse im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz-Birkenau 1939-1945*, Rowohlt Verlag, Reinbek bei Hamburg 1989, p. 160.

[181] J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, New York 1989, p. 204 (<http://holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/pressac/technique-and-operation/pressac0204.shtml>).

[182] J.-C. Pressac, “The Machinery of Mass Murder at Auschwitz,” in: I. Gutman, M. Berenbaum (eds.), *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington/Indianapolis 1994, p. 210.

[183] J.-C. Pressac, *Les crématoires d’Auschwitz. La machinerie du meurtre de masse*, CNSR Editions, Paris 1993, p. 48 :

“Fixer, selon les ordres de Himmler et de Kammler, l’effectif du KGL de Birkenau à 200000 détenus entraînait un nouvel agrandissement du camp et un renforcement de sa capacité d’incinération [...]. Fin juillet, une quatrième section de 600000 prisonniers fut ajoutée, placée au sud de la première, portant ainsi la capacité du camp à 200000.”

[184] See in this regard, my study *The Central Construction Office of the Waffen-SS and Police Auschwitz. Organization, Responsibilities, Activities*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2005 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/cco).

[185] Incredibly, Schnabel wrote “10-35 corpses” whereas the original text

states “30-36.” Danuta Czech, who relied on this source, reproduced the same error and the same goes for Zimmerman.

[186] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 26), p. 189.

[187] *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, op. cit. (note 15), p. 91; in G. Rudolf (ed.), *ibid.*, note 7, p. 118.

[188] The Polish preposition “przez” (through) with “around.”

[189] The Auschwitz crematory ovens cremated by direct process, to be precise, the gas generator combustion products entered directly into the muffle.

[190] RGVA, 502-1-313, pp. 159f.

[191] Pressac justifiably thinks that the term signified interrogation by the Gestapo.

[192] C. Mattogno, op. cit. (note 28), p. 54.

[193] The quantity of coke burned in one hour on the furnace grate.

[194] On the other days – if the Zimmerman interpretation were correct - the resulting duration fluctuates between 8 and 30 minutes.

[195] There were 12 cremation ovens in the Birkenau camp. The number 46 refers to the number of cremation chambers or muffles.

[196] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 26), p. 212.

[197] *Ibid.*, note 74 on page 243.

[198] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 25), pp. 98f.

[199] C. Mattogno, F. Deana, “The Crematoria Ovens of Auschwitz and Birkenau,” in: E. Gauss (=G. Rudolf, ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust. The Growing Critique of “Truth” and “Memory,”* Theses and Dissertations Press, Capshaw, Alabama, 2000, pp. 390f.

[200] *The Höss Trial*, volume II, p. 47.

[201] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 26), p. 189f.

[202] See below, chapter II.12, p. 161.

[203] *Malachia de Christophoris, Étude pratique sur la crémation moderne*, Treves, Milano 1890, pp. 121-124.

[204] *Zentralblatt für Feuerbestattung*, 1929, p. 64.

[205] Luigi Maccone, *Storia documentata della cremazione*, Bergamo 1932, p. 66.

[206] Theodor Weinisch, *Die Feuerbestattung im Lichte der Statistik*, Zirndorf 1929, p. 33.

[207] G. Pini, *La crémation en Italie et à l'étranger de 1774 jusqu'à nos jours*, Hoepli, Milano 1885, p. 30.

[208] Rudolf Jakobschötter, “Die Entwicklung der elektrischen Einäscherung bis zu dem neuen elektrisch beheizten Heisslufteinäscherungssofen in Erfurt,” in: *Gesundheits Ingenieur*, October 25, 1941, issue no. 43, p. 583.

- [209] Fred A. Leuchter, *An Engineering Report on the alleged Execution Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland*, Samisdat Publishers, Toronto 1988, p. 188.
- [210] Auschwitz Museum Archive, BW 30/34, p. 42.
- [211] August 15, 1940, RGVA, 502-1-327, p. 215.
- [212] In the Gusen camp, 887 prisoners died in November 1941 and 986 in December. Hans Maršálek, *Die Geschichte des Konzentrationslagers Mauthausen*, 2nd ed., Österr. Lagergemeinschaft Mauthausen, Vienna 1980, p. 156.
- [213] BKA, NS4 Ma/54.
- [214] This comes from a deposition of Eugen Seibold dated November 10, 1945. Dachau Museum Archives, 767, p. 84.
- [215] Op. cit. (note 8, 2003 edition), pp. 400f.
- [216] Mauthausen Museum Archives, 3 12/31, 350.
- [217] *Konzentrationslager Buchenwald*, Thüringer Volksverlag GmbH, Weimar, no date, p. 85.
- [218] In many cases, death of typhus victims occurred due to various organ failures caused by what is called typhus. If merely such organ failure was reported in the death records, then this does not mean that typhus did not exist. Similar today, if someone dies of AIDS, medical records might hardly ever say “Aids” or “HIV” but name the actual medical reasons, which can be rather complex. That does not mean the victim did not die of what we popularly refer to as “Aids.” Editor’s remark.
- [219] Staatliches Museum Auschwitz (ed.), *Sterbebücher von Auschwitz*, Saur, Munich 1995, p. 242.
- [220] It should have been very easy for these two analysts to indicate the exact number of these cases, just as they had indicated the exact numbers concerning a great deal of other data.
- [221] C. Mattogno, “The Zimmerman Aid Committee and their Bag of Tricks,” *The Revisionist* 3(1&2) (2005), in preparation.
- [222] *Inmitten des grauenvollen Verbrechens. Handschriften von Mitgliedern des Sonderkommandos*, Verlag des staatlichen Auschwitz-Birkenau Museums, 1996, p. 37, note 28.
- [223] D. Czech, op. cit. (note 24), p. 432.
- [224] G. Fleming, *Hitler and the Final Solution*, University of California Press, Berkeley 1994.
- [225] Jürgen Graf, “Anatomie der sowjetischen Befragung der Topf-Ingenieure,” *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung* 6(4) (2002), pp. 398-421.
- [226] The ovens of civilian crematoria.
- [227] The pre-heating of the air for combustion took place in the recuperator.
- [228] Because these ovens were without recuperators.
- [229] Error by the Russian translator. The ovens of crematories II & III were

equipped with blowers.

- [230] G. Fleming, op. cit. (note 68), pp. 206f.
- [231] For more details see my article already quoted, op. cit. (note 65).
- [232] Edizioni di Ar; Engl. see note 28.
- [233] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 27), p. 1.
- [234] R.J. van Pelt, *The Case for Auschwitz. Evidence from the Irving Trial*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington/Indianapolis 2002, p. 207. When working on this book, van Pelt also had the support of John Zimmerman (p. XIV) and that is plain to see!
- [235] “Übergabe der Zentralbauleitung durch SS-Sturmbannführer (S) Bischoff an SS-Obersturmführer (F) Jothann and Verzeichnis der Akten.” January 5, 1944. RGVA, 502-1-48, pp. 42-49.
- [236] VHA, Fond OT, 25/7, pp.299-303.
- [237] A *Sachgebiet* was a subsection of the Central Construction Office in charge of certain areas, like planning, administration, statistics, etc.
- [238] APMO, BW 30/40, p. 70.
- [239] APMO, BW 30/34, p. 53.
- [240] RGVA, 502-1-48, p. 45.
- [241] G. Fleming, op. cit. (note 68), p. 202.
- [242] Interrogation of K. Prüfer on March 5, 1946. FSBRS, N-19262, p. 37.
- [243] APMO, BW 30/25, p. 8.
- [244] Letter from *Zentralbauleitung* to Topf dated July 17, 1943. APMO, BW 30/34, p. 17.
- [245] “*Dringendes Telegramm*” (urgent telegram) from Bischoff dated May 14, 1943. APMO, BW 30/34, p. 41.
- [246] *Aktenvermerk* by Jährling dated September 14, 1943. RGVA, 502-1-26, pp. 144-146.
- [247] Deposition by H. Tauber dated May 24, 1945, in: J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 25), p. 494.
- [248] The letter of Topf of March 2, 1943.
- [249] C. Mattogno, in G. Rudolf (ed.), op. cit. (note 15), p. 160f.
- [250] Ibid., p. 184
- [251] Ibid., p. 185.
- [252] Ibid., p. 186.
- [253] Ibid., p. 171.
- [254] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 27), p. 73.
- [255] RGVA, 502-1-313, p. 44.
- [256] Now at www.vho.org/GB/c/CM/gasprufer.html (version of Nov. 28, 2000); an expanded and updated version was published as “The ‘Gas Testers’ of Auschwitz” in *The Revisionist*, 2(2) (2004), pp. 140-154.

- [257] Ibid., version in *The Revisionist*, p. 144. The last phrase “and of their work-place, i.e. Crematorium II” is my own comment.
- [258] Ibid., p. 148.
- [259] *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend*, op. cit. (note 15), p. 64; in G. Rudolf (ed.), *ibid.*, p. 156. Here I recalled that the gas chamber operated with hydrogen cyanide of BW 5a and 5b was named “*Vergasungsraum*” in a document of October 1941.
- [260] “The ‘Gas Testers’ of Auschwitz,” op. cit. (note 100); C. Mattogno, “The Morgues of the Crematoria at Birkenau in the Light of Documents,” *ibid.*, 2(3) (2004), pp. 271-294.
- [261] www.vho.org/GB/c/CM/lalett.html; printed in *The Revisionist* 3(1&2) (2005), in preparation.
- [262] In fact, the letter has for object: “*Fertigstellung d. Krematoriums III*,” RGVA, 502-1-314, p. 14.
- [263] RGVA, 502-1-26, p. 195.
- [264] In the original English online version of my article translated by Russ Granata there was a translation error in this regard, stating “without indication of the Übergabeverhandlung and crematoria Leistung,” which has been corrected in the current version (note 105): “with indication of the Übergabeverhandlung and without crematoria Leistung.”
- [265] Point 36 of my response to Zimmerman. The source of the document is: AMM, 3 12/31, 350.
- [266] Prof. Dr. P. Schläpfer, “Ueber [sic] den Bau und den Betrieb von Krematorien,” separate reprint from *Jahresbericht des Verbandes Schweizer Feuerbestattungsvereine*, Zürich 1936, p. 36, see illustration.
- [267] Naturally it is always necessary to add the heat produced by the coffin.
- [268] The period October 26-30, during which 129 corpses were cremated with 80 wheelbarrows of coke = 4,800 kg, that is $(4,800 \div 129 =)$ 37.2 kg per corpse.
- [269] AMM, 3 12/31, 353.
- [270] AMM, 3 12/31, 351.
- [271] ÖDMM, B 12/31, p. 353.
- [272] *Ibid.*, B 12/31, p. 352.
- [273] No cremations were carried out on September 30.
- [274] The average mortality in the month of September was 14 deaths per day.
- [275] It obviously concerns an arithmetic mean in which the days on which no cremations took place are also included; the average number of cremated in the above table is calculated on the same basis.
- [276] I grant the benefit of the doubt. The first digit of minutes is difficult to read and could be a zero, so the time could be 10:00.
- [277] I convert “wheelbarrows” (*Karren*) to kg directly since the document specifies that “1 K. = 60 kg”

[278] 105 minutes from 9.15 to 11.00, plus about another 35 minutes to the time of 11.00 in order to burn the 120 kg of coke “added.”

[279] 120 minutes from 11.00 to 13.00, plus 70 minutes to the time 13.00 in order to burn the 240 kg of coke “added.”

[280] Comprehensive time calculated on the basis of the column “Uhr” and the 1,685 minutes, to which I add the necessary time to burn the coke “added” at the end of each day (that is 180 kg to 12 noon 26/9, 120 kg to 11:30 of 29/9 and so on), in total 36 wheelbarrows = 2,160 kg, the combustion of which, according to Zimmerman, would have required $2,160 \div 210 =$ about 615 minutes.

[281] The enumeration passes from eight wheelbarrows concerning 11:00 hours to 24 wheelbarrows concerning 16:00 hours.

[282] Hans Maršálek, op. cit. (note 56), p. 156.

[283] With a draft of a 10 mm column of water.

[284] “*Bescheinigung über gegen besondere Berechnung geleistete Tagelohn-Arbeiten*”

[285] BAK, NS 4 Ma/54.

[286] An oven of Gebrüder Beck, Offenbach, with an optimally constructed system which engineer Kessler preliminarily made even more efficient thanks to various improved techniques.

[287] “The Crematoria Ovens...,” op. cit., (note 8, 2003), pp. 395f.

[288] The maximum cremation temperature which emerges from many diagrams – which I publish in my work – is 1,120°C, maintained for a few minutes during the combustion of the coffin.

[289] In Ernst Gauss (ed.), op. cit. (note 8), p. 304. This passage is not part of the more recent English edition of 2003, op. cit. (note 8), since this article has been considerably superseded by my book, op. cit. (note 10).

[290] “The Crematoria Ovens...,” op. cit., (note 8, 2003), pp. 394f.

[291] The Gusen oven went into operation on January 29, 1941.

[292] Regarding this, see my study, the “*Zentralbauleitung der Waffen-SS und Polizei Auschwitz*.” Edizioni di Ar, 1998.

[293] “Gusener Krematorium verbrannte *schätzungsweise* Leichen....” AMM, 7/7, Nr.4, ISD Arolsen.

[294] APMO, BW 30/34, p. 42.

[295] The text says erroneously “selbstverständlich.”

[296] In the text appears erroneously “dieevtl.”

[297] I have corrected (and underlined) the eleven (!) transcription errors of Zimmerman in this one sentence, who has clearly never heard of “Umlaute.” Moreover, he transcribed the letter “ß” in “Abstoßen” with a single “s” and has managed to make three errors in the transcription of “Schürgeräte,” which he writes as “Schugerate”! As we see, we are faced with a real specialist in the German language who is in a position to

carry out the deepest philological analysis of the documents!

[298] Read: "Mängel."

[299] BAK, NS 4 Ma/54: "*Von unserer Baustelle in Gusen wird uns mitgeteilt, dass beim Verbrennungsofen verschiedene Mängel festgestellt wurden. Die Ummantelung zeigt, dass sie an verschiedenen Stellen abblättert. Wir ersuchen Sie daher, uns umgehend ¶10 Sack Monolit u. ¶6 Stck Monolit-Kreuze ¶zuzusenden, damit im Falle grösserer Schäden das erforderliche Material zur Ausbesserung vorhanden ist. Die Auslieferung erbitten wir ohne jede Verzögerung. Bestellschein und Frachtbrief mit Speerzettel I liegen bei.*"

[300] "*für die vom Feuer berührten Teile von Feuerungsanlagen*"

[301] Letter from Topf to the Bauleitung of Mauthausen of January 24, 1942. BAK, NS 4 Ma/54.

[302] BAK, NS 4 Ma/54: "*Wir nehmen den Auftrag an aufgrund unserer Ihnen bekannten Allgemeinen Lieferungs-Bedingungen B.*"

[303] This concerns granular isolating material which served to fill in the cracks in the oven.

[304] Versandanzeige of the firm Custodis of 25 June 1941. BAK, NS 4 Ma/54.

[305] "*Die von Ihnen weiterhin erwähnten 50 Sack Monolit gehören zu den Baustoffen, die wir zur Errichtung eines neuen Einäscherungsofen anlieferten; eine Sonderrechnung über dieses Material lassen wir Ihnen nicht zugehen.*"

[306] Letter from Topf to the SS-Neubauleitung of Mauthausen of 25 August 1941. BAK, NS 4 Ma/54.

[307] Letter of 28 August 1941 from the Mauthausen SS-Neubauleitung to Topf. BAK, NS 4 Ma/54.

[308] The material had not yet been paid for.

[309] Letter of 4 September 1941 from Topf to SS-Neubauleitung of Mauthausen.

[310] Letter of September 24, 1941, from Bauleiter Naumann to Topf. BAK, NS 4 Ma/54.

[311] RGVA, 502-1-327, p. 180.

[312] NTN 95, pp. 20-24 (copy of the list of transports to Auschwitz).

[313] NTN, MSW London, 113, p. 518.

[314] Rudolf Jakobsköter, op. cit. (note 52), p. 585.

[315] The German text says "*Lebensdauer.*"

[316] Ibid., p. 587.

[317] Duden. *Deutsches Universal Wörterbuch*, Dudenverlag 1983, p. 1009: "*als möglich u. wahrscheinlich annehmen.*" (I indicate the page for Zimmerman).

[318] Hans Keller, *Der elektrifizierte Ofen im Krematorium Biel*, Biel 1935, pp. 3f: "*Bis jetzt fanden im elektrischen Ofen 200 Kremationen statt. Die feuerfesten Steine sehen noch aus wie neu, was beim Koksofen nach dieser Zahl von Einäscherungen nicht*

gesagt werden durfte. [...] Der Ofen hat daher eine gleichmässige Wärmeverteilung, was zur Erhöhung seiner Lebensdauer beiträgt.”

[319] According to the information of engineer Tilly in *Die Wärmewirtschaft*, no. 2, 1927, pp. 21f.

[320] “Angebot auf einen Feuerbestattungsofen mit Koksbeheizung nach beiliegender Zeichnung,” p. 3. Archive of the Kuratorium für das Sühnmal KZ Dachau, 361/2111.

[321] BAK, NS 4-Ma 54.

[322] “The Crematoria Ovens...,” op. cit. (note 8, 2003), pp. 385-387. As with the Müller oven, only fire-bricks without refractory mortar, isolated bricks and crushed monolith are referred to.

[323] *Kostenanschlag* from Topf of 16 November 1942 for an eight-muffle oven. RGVA, 502-1-313, p. 73.

[324] There were four gas generators in the eight-muffle oven, each of which served two muffles.

[325] URSS-64.

[326] The eight-muffle oven constituted two blocks of four-muffle ovens.

[327] *Allgemeine Lieferungsbedingungen A*, already enclosed in the *Kosten-Anschlag* from Topf of November 1, 1940, regarding a two-muffle oven heated with coke. BAK, NS 4 Ma/54: “Auf die regelrechte Abnutzung, namentlich der Roste, des Schamottemauerwerkes und anderer, dem Feuer ausgesetzter Teile bezieht sich die Gewähr nicht.”

[328] H. Thompson, *Die moderne Leichenverbrennung*, Fischers Medizinische Buchhandlung, Berlin 1889, p. 15; Engl.: *Modern Cremation, its History and Practice*, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co, London 1889.

[329] Friedrich Goppelsroeder, *Über Feuerbestattung*, Wenz & Peters, Mühlhausen (Alsace) 1890, p. 24.

[330] M. Pauly, *Die Feuerbestattung*, Verlagsbuchhandlung J. J. Weber, Leipzig 1904, pp. 160f.

[331] An average stillborn embryo has only some 2-5% of the mass of an average adult.

[332] M. Pauly, op. cit. (note 174), pp. 156f.

[333] This is the date of the source given by Zimmerman in “Body Disposal,” note 103.

[334] APMO, BW 30/7/34, p. 54.

[335] Duration confirmed by Kurt Prüfer, as is seen above.

[336] On the actual coke consumption for typical corpses see “The Crematoria Ovens...,” op. cit., (note 8, 2003), pp. 392f.

[337] Ibid., p. 400.

[338] Of the 41 cremation lists examined, 18 lists have over 20 cremations per

day, 10 lists have over 15 such entries. The maximum number of cremations for one furnace is 27. To save on fuel, cremations were generally carried out in two shifts in a single oven which always stayed hot. In this way, each of the four ovens was used periodically.

[339] “The Crematoria Ovens...,” op. cit., (note 8, 2003), p. 397.

[340] RGVA, 502-1-272, p. 256: “*Durch die fortgesetzte Inbetriebnahme (Tag- und Nachtbetrieb) hat der Kamin durch Überhitzung Schaden erlitten.*”

[341] Report of Pollock to Bischoff of 30 May 1942. RGVA, 502-1-314, p. 12.

[342] The facility of Krema II was irreparably damaged after a few days of use and was dismantled.

[343] BAK, NS 4-Ma 54: “*umlegbaren Schornstein von 4 m Höhe, Saugzuganlage.*”

[344] Ibid.: “*1 Wagen für die Gebläse-Station mit 3 Gebläsen.*”

[345] Telegram by SS-Neubauleitung of Mauthausen camp to Topf dated December 19, 1940. BAK, NS 4 Ma/54.

[346] Letter by Topf to SS-Neubauleitung of Mauthausen camp dated December 23, 1940. BAK, NS 4 Ma/54.

[347] Topf, “*Bescheinigung über gegen besondere Berechnung geleistete Tagelohn-Arbeiten für Firma: SS-Neubauleitung d. Kz.L. Mauthausen,*” BAK, NS 4 Ma/54.

[348] Letter by SS-Neubauleitung of Mauthausen camp to Topf dated February 14, 1941. BAK, NS 4 Ma/54.

[349] In reality *Zentralbauleitung*.

[350] Danuta Czech, op. cit. (note 24), p. 240.

[351] Franciszek Piper, “Gas Chamber and Crematoria,” in: I. Gutman, M. Berenbaum (eds.), op. cit. (note 26), p. 165. The archive reference is the same as that provided by D. Czech: “D.Z.bau/6” (op. cit., note 24, p. 179) from the “collection Zentralbauleitung.”

[352] *Recte*: Schlesische Industriebau Lenz u. Co.-AG, Kattowitz, Grundmannstrasse 23.

[353] The future crematorium II. At the time it was the only one being planned and was therefore simply called “Krematorium” in the documents.

[354] GARF, 7021-108-32, pp. 46f.

[355] RGVA, 502-1-83, which mentions an “*Angebot der Firma Huta über die Bauarbeiten [...] für den Ausbau des Krematoriums im KGL vom 8.7.1942.*”

[356] Various authors, *Auschwitz. Il campo della morte*, Edizioni del Museo Statale di Auschwitz-Birkenau, 1997, pp. 29f. Here D. Czech does not even provide any archival references.

[357] After Pressac, no supporter of the reality of the Holocaust can seriously maintain that the Birkenau crematoria were *planned* as homicidal gas chambers.

- [358] The English edition of the work is dated 1996.
- [359] RGVA, 502-1-275, p. 35.
- [360] “*Da sich inzwischen die Belegstärke vergrößert hat und verschiedene andere Gesichtspunkte berücksichtigt werden mussten, wurde der beiliegende Lageplan Nr. 1453 vom 8.7.42 aufgearbeitet, welcher zusätzlich folgende Baracken enthält.*” For references I refer to my work on cremation at Auschwitz.
- [361] “*Die Erweiterung der Planung hat anlässlich des Reichsführer-Besuches am 17. und 18. Juli 1942 dem Amtsgruppenchef C SS-Brigadeführer und Generalmajor der Waffen-SS Dr. Ing. Kammler vorgelegen.*”
- [362] D. Dwork & R.J. van Pelt, *Auschwitz 1270 to the present*. W.W. Norton & Company, New York London 1996, Plate 13.
- [363] GARF, 7021-108-32, p. 41.
- [364] Published by J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 25), p. 203.
- [365] The figures are based on statistical processing of data contained in the *Sterbebücher* of Auschwitz.
- [366] *Sterbebücher von Auschwitz*, op. cit. (note), 1995, p. 242.
- [367] *IMT*, vol. XX, p. 507.
- [368] “*Bemerkungen über die Behandlung mit Präparat 3582/IGF/ bei Fleckfieber,*” Auschwitz, February 8, 1943. Trial of the camp garrison, Volume 59, p. 61: “*Von den 15 Verstorbenen starben: 6 an Herzmuskelschwäche, 6 wegen toxischer Kachexie, 2 wegen Hirnkomplikationen (Encefalitis), 1 wegen eines in der Folge aufgetretenen Fiebers, dessen Ursprung nicht festgestellt werden konnte.*”
- [369] Johann Neuhäusler, *Wie war das im KZ Dachau?* Kuratorium für das Sühnemal KZ Dachau, Dachau 1980, p. 22. Identical figures are in another work edited by “Comitato Internazionale di Dachau”: *Il campo di Concentramento di Dachau 1933-1945*, 1978, p. 212. Here too the figures refer to “detainees arriving at Dachau.”
- [370] Joseph Billig, *Les camps de concentration dans l'économie du Reich hitlérien*, Presses Universitaires de France, 1973, p. 75.
- [371] D. Czech, op. cit. (note 24), p. 860. The date is August 20, 1944.
- [372] Johann Neuhäusler, op. cit. (note 213), p. 26.
- [373] NO-3864.
- [374] Technical drawing No. J Nr. 9122.
- [375] E. Kogon, H. Langbein, A. Rückerl (eds.), *Nationalsozialistische Massentötung durch Giftgas. Eine Dokumentation*. S. Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt/Main 1983, p. 278.
- [376] H. Maršálek, op. cit. (note 56), pp. 156f.
- [377] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 27), pp. 116f. In my “Observations,” I wrote through a slip “beginning of December.”
- [378] *Konzentrationslager Buchenwald*. Weimar, without date, pp. 84-85.

- [379] Ibid., p. 85.
- [380] 15 muffles in the future Krema III and 16 muffles in Kremas IV and V.
- [381] “Erläuterungsbericht zum prov. Ausbau des Konzentrationslager Auschwitz O/S,” RGVA, 502-1-223, p. 1ff.
- [382] “Erläuterungsbericht zum Bauvorhaben Konzentrationslager Auschwitz O/S,” RGVA, 502-1-220, p. 1ff.
- [383] “Laut Befehl des Reichsführers-SS und Chef der Deutschen Polizei ist auf Gelände der ehemaligen polnischen Artilleriekaserne in Auschwitz O/S ein Konzentrationslager für vorerst 30000 Häftlinge zu errichten.”
- [384] Miklos Nyiszli, *Auschwitz. A Doctor's Eyewitness Account*, New York 1961, p. 68.
- [385] Op. cit. (note 8), Engl. edition.
- [386] Granata, Palos Verdes 1996, p. 43.
- [387] This booklet is now available from Castle Hill Publishers (online at www.vho.org). It was also for sale on the old website of Russ Granata, where Zimmerman found all of Carlo's articles.
- [388] *Höss Trial*, vol. 11a, p. 96. I give the text with all its errors.
- [389] This date is definitely due to an error. If repairs had to be carried out between June 3 and July 20, they could not have ended on July 4. One must therefore read July 24.
- [390] The Koehler firm had constructed and repaired the smoke flues and chimney of the crematoria II & III.
- [391] RGVA, 502-1-83, p. 377.
- [392] H. Keller, *Ursache der Rauchbildung bei der Kremation*, Biel 1945.
- [393] NA, Mission USEC/R 86. Can B 10658, Exposure 5018.
- [394] *Auschwitz: Open Air Incinerations*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2005 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/aoai).
- [395] As I have already shown in my “Observations,” this is another Zimmerman imposture. In “The Crematoria Ovens...,” to which Zimmerman refers, I wrote: “Mass graves were almost certainly located to the southwest of the ‘temporary earth basin’[a], about 650 ft. west of what was to become Sector BIII of Birkenau, since the air photos from 1944 – specifically those from May 31 – show traces of four huge, parallel pits in that area” (op. cit., note 8, 2003, p. 412). So I refer neither to “burning pits” nor to an area of the “White Bunker!”
- a) Imprecise translation. The “*Kläranlage*” is a sewage or waste water treatment plant.
- [396] See the plans of March 3, 1945, published by J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 25), p. 180.
- [397] F. Müller, *Sonderbehandlung*, Steinhausen, Munich 1979, p. 200.
- [398] Ibid., p. 207.
- [399] Ibid., pp. 211f.

- [400] Ibid., p. 212.
- [401] The oven is named “Ener-Tek II.”
- [402] The day of arrival of the first transport of Hungarian Jews.
- [403] F. Müller, op. cit. (note 241), p. 219.
- [404] The minimum area available for each corpse was $320 \div 400 = 0.8 \text{ m}^2$.
- [405] F. Müller states that the duration of combustion was 5-6 hours (p. 221). To this must be added the time needed to fill the pit with 1,200 corpses and with not less than 360 tons of wood, apart from the time needed to remove some tons of ash, so that the average combustion per day for each pit appears just too optimistic.
- [406] Dr. H. Fröhlich, op. cit. (note 16), pp. 109f.
- [407] Ground photographs taken after allied bombardments of German cities show open-air pyres with metallic beams on which several layers of German victims are placed. These photographs only show the beginning of “cremation”; to my knowledge none show the end result. In my opinion, one only wanted to obtain the carbonization of the victims’ soft tissue in order to avoid epidemics.
- [408] *The Bunkers of Auschwitz. Black propaganda versus History*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2005 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/tboa).
- [409] In I. Gutman, M. Berenbaum (eds.), op. cit. (note 26), p. 164.
- [410] Also, if they had been recently bulldozed, the vegetation around them would have been destroyed by the intensive earth-moving work with both men and machinery. Yet the area around those former graves looks untouched. Editor’s remark.
- [411] D. Czech, op. cit. (note 24), p. 27.
- [412] I have dealt with this topic more thoroughly in my study *Auschwitz: Open Air Incinerations*, op. cit. (note 238).
- [413] Editions Interpress, Warsaw 1978, unnumbered photographic appendix between pp. 176f.
- [414] Krajowa Agencja Wydawnicza, Warszawa 1980, p. 184.
- [415] Editions du Seuil, Paris 1983, p. 221.
- [416] *Oswiecim-Brzezinka (Auschwitz-Birkenau) Concentration camp*, Warszawa 1961, p. 142.
- [417] There is a black zone in the photographs outside these limits which corresponds to the walls of the location around the door. So that if the photograph is “expanded” it gains nothing more of the field of view but is only enlarged.
- [418] APMO, microfilm n. 1063/35d.
- [419] *Intervista sull’Olocausto*, Edizioni di AR, 1995, p. 50. *My Banned Holocaust Interview*, op. cit. (note 14) is the English language edition of this booklet.
- [420] It is practically impossible to precisely establish the number of corpses, because their contours are for the most part indistinguishable; nevertheless at the left side of photo 278 the layer of corpses begins with three bodies and those in the lower row are about 10, so the total number of corpses would have to be of about 30-40.

- [421] The point from which photographs 277 and 278 were shot.
- [422] These two photographs were taken in the last ten days of August 1944.
- [423] Cf. my article “‘Cremation Pits’ and Ground Water Levels at Birkenau,” in: *The Revisionist*, 1(1) (2003), pp. 13-16.
- [424] A cabbalistic method in interpreting the meaning of words on base to their numerical value. In the Hebraic alphabet every letter corresponds to a number. Hence, if the numerical value of “Auschwitz” is 75 and that of “extermination” is equally 75, this coincidence then allegedly “proves” that Auschwitz was an extermination camp!
- [425] APMO, BW 30/27, p. 49.
- [426] RGVA, 502-1-313, p. 59.
- [427] Actually, Dejaco was *SS-Untersturmführer* – second lieutenant – at the time. Another example of the crass ignorance of Zimmerman and his group of translators.
- [428] Read: *Verschluß*.
- [429] RGVA, 502-1-280, p. 187: “*laut Befehl des Reichsführer-SS sämtliche Pläne über Bauten in Konzentrationslager als Geheimepläne zu betrachten sind.*” The letter was written because at the time of his transfer to Auschwitz, *SS-Obersturmführer* Fritzsche was pursuing various plans for Dachau.
- [430] “*Vernichtungsprotokoll über die Vernichtung der ‘Geheimen Sachen’ und ‘Geheimen Reichssachen’*,” Vojenský Historický Archiv, Prague, Fond OT, 25/7, pp. 299-303.
- [431] www.holocaust-history.org/~dkeren/cremation/discussion.shtml.
- [432] Staatsarchiv Weimar, LK 4651: “*Die Tatsache besteht, dass die Schamottematerialien länger halten, wenn im Ofen dauernd gleichmässige Temperatur herrscht.*”
- [433] Topf, Allgemeine Lieferungsbedingungen A, p. 2: “*Gewähr auf die Dauer von 6 Monaten, bei Tag- und Nachtbetrieb von 3 Monate.*”
- [434] I say “presumed” because experience teaches us that there is a great difference between theoretical statements or manufacturers’ advertisements for the ovens and practice.
- [435] The crematory ovens functioned with a coefficient of excess air of about 3 (= 3 times the theoretical air), and this was one of the inevitable reasons for the high consumption of these facilities.
- [436] This figure is due to a printing error. The real figure was 2,500.
- [437] Normally from 500 to 700°C, according to the type of oven.
- [438] And when a corpse is introduced without a coffin.
- [439] In practice, the Volckmann-Ludwig oven – which was advertised as a facility working without supplementary heat – needed on average the equivalent of about 22 (= $(4,500 \times 7 + 35 \times 3,500) \div 7,000$) kg of coke for each cremation!
- [440] Fred A. Leuchter, Robert Faurisson, Germar Rudolf, *The Leuchter*

Reports. Critical Edition, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2005
(www.vho.org/GB/Books/tlr).

[441] This claim played a role in the verdict which should not be underestimated, cf. judgment Gray, civil case before Queen's Bench Division, Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London, David John Cawdell Irving vs. (1) Penguin Books Limited, (2) Deborah E. Lipstadt, Ref. 1996 I, No. 113 (www.holocaustdenialontrial.com/); §13.79; see my critique of this judgment in Germar Rudolf, Carlo Mattogno, *Auschwitz: The Case against Insanity*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, in preparation.

[442] Errol Morris, *Mr. Death: The Rise and Fall of Fred A. Leuchter, Jr.*, first publicly shown in January 1999 during the Sundance Film Festivals in Park City (Utah); a slightly shortened, commented version can be purchased (VHS: Universal Studios 2001; DVD: Lions Gate Home Entertainment, 2003).

[443] Robert J. van Pelt, *Pelt Report*, introduced during above mentioned trial, p. 307 (www.holocaustdenialontrial.com/evidence/van.asp).

[444] *The Rudolf Report*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003, pp. 254f. (www.vho.org/GB/Books/trr).

[445] W. Braker, A.L. Mossman, *Matheson Gas Data Book*, Matheson Gas Products, East Rutherford 1971, p. 301; R.C. Weast (ed.), *Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*, 66th ed., CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida 1986, p. E 40.

[446] L. Schwarz, W. Deckert, *Zeitschrift für Hygiene und Infektionskrankheiten*, 107 (1927), pp. 798-813; *ibid.*, 109 (1929), pp. 201-212.

[447] DIN 4108 DIN 4108, part 3 to 5, deals with diffusion of steam into building materials. The most important coefficient for building materials is the so-called coefficient of diffusion resistance; this is a dimensionless number indicating, how much longer the diffusion of steam takes to penetrate a layer of certain materials compared to the time it takes to diffuse through the same layer of still air. This coefficient is valid not only for water vapor, but also for gaseous hydrogen cyanide as well as for any other gas. In the list of 100 different building materials compiled in DIN 4108 part 4, one can find lime and cement mortar with diffusion resistances from 15 to 35, in which case the resistance grows with increasing cement content, for gypsum plaster, the coefficient is 10, for brick walls 5 to 10, for glass wool mats it is 1. That means, if a gas diffuses through a layer of still air with a speed of 1 cm per second, it does take 15 to 35 seconds to diffuse through a 1 cm thick layer of lime or cement mortar and 5 to 10 seconds to diffuse just as deep into a brick wall. (I am grateful to Mr. C.H. Christmann for this reference.) In this regard, compare also the analysis about the porosity of masonry in my expert report, *op. cit.* (note 5), graph 7, p. 183.

[448] *Op. cit.* (note 5), color section after p. 200.

[449] Barbara Kulaszka, *Did Six Million Really Die? Report on the Evidence in the Canadian 'False News' Trial of Ernst Zündel – 1988*, Samisdat Publishers Ltd., Toronto 1992, p. 363 (protocol pp. 33-9291;

www.zundelsite.org/english/dsmrd/dsmrdtoc.html).

[450] Statements by van Pelts in Errol Morris' documentary film *Mr. Death: The Rise and Fall of Fred A. Leuchter, Jr.*, first publicly shown in January 1999 during the Sundance Film Festivals in Park City (Utah); a slightly shortened, commented version can be purchased (VHS: Universal Studios 2001; DVD: Lions Gate Home Entertainment, 2003).

[451] Michael Shermer, Alex Grobman, *Denying History. Who Says the Holocaust Never Happened and Why Do They Say it?*, University of California, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 2002. In the following citations only the page numbers will be given for this book.

[452] See Chapter 2.

[453] The strange title finds its explanation in the fact that Italian anti-revisionist Valentina Pisanty, whose book *L'irritante questione delle camere a gas* is criticized by Mattogno in this work, is a professional fairy tale teller and expert on the interpretation and the history of the fairy tale of Little Red Riding Hood.

[454] Both articles were available on the Internet since 2000; they are now posted at www.vho.org/GB/c/CM.

[455] Cf. in this respect Paul Rassinier, *The Holocaust Story and the Lies of Ulysses*, The Institute for Historical Review, Costa Mesa, California, 1978, pp. 107-209.

[456] See the revisionist online database at <http://www.vho.org/search/d/> for a list of each author's contributions.

[457] Robert J. van Pelt, *Pelt Report*, introduced during the civil case before Queen's Bench Division, Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London, David John Cawdell Irving vs. (1) Penguin Books Limited, (2) Deborah E. Lipstadt, Ref. 1996 I, No. 113 (www.holocaustdenialontrial.com/evidence/van.asp).

[458] For example the book by Georges Wellers, *Les chambres à gas ont existé*, Gallimard, Paris 1981, and the collective work by E. Kogon, H. Langbein, A. Rückerl et al. (eds.), *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas*, S. Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt/Main 1983, from which I quote (Engl.: *Nazi Mass Murder*, Yale University Press, New Haven 1993.)

[459] Gerald Reitlinger, *The Final Solution. The Attempt to Exterminate the Jews of Europe 1939-1945*, Vallentine, Mitchell, London 1953, 1965, pp. 150-152.

[460] Raymond Philips (ed.), *Trial of Josef Kramer and Forty-four Others (The Belsen Trial)*, William Hodge and Company Limited, London-Edinburgh-Glasgow 1946, pp. 66-78.

[461] The rather fantastic report contains a description of crematoria II and III of Birkenau with totally invented drawings: Vrba and Wetzler place the alleged homicidal gas chamber (*Leichenkeller I*) – which was half underground – on the same level as the furnace room and connect it to the latter by means of a narrow-gauge railway which never existed; they furthermore describe 9 ovens placed around a chimney, whereas those crematoria had 5 ovens of 3 muffles each placed in a line. For the design

of the crematoria and their actual plan cf. my study *Olocausto: dilettanti allo sbaraglio*, Edizioni di Ar, Padua 1996, pp. 293f., and “Auschwitz 27 gennaio 1945 – 27 gennaio 2005: sessant’anni di propaganda. Genesi, sviluppo e declino della menzogna propagandistica delle camere a gas,” *I Quaderni di Auschwitz*, no. 5. Effepi, Genova 2005, pp. 24-27.

[462] Cf. in this respect my study “*Auschwitz: due false testimonianze*,” Edizioni La Sfinge, Parma 1986, pp. 19-25.

[463] The term has no documentary basis. No known document refers to the personnel assigned to the crematoria as “*Sonderkommando*,” whereas there existed at Birkenau at least 11 “*Sonderkommandos*” unrelated to the crematoria. In this respect see C. Mattogno, *Special Treatment in Auschwitz*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2004, pp. 101-103.

[464] Miklos Nyiszli, *Auschwitz. A Doctor’s Eyewitness Account*, Fawcett Crest, New York 1961, pp. 44f. The Hungarian original reads: “*ez a terem olyan nagyságú, mint a vetkezőterem*” (“this hall is just as big as the undressing room”), that is: 200 m long. (*Dr. Mengele boncolóorvosa voltam az auschwitz-i krematóriumban*, Oradea, Nagyvárád, 1946, p. 34).

[465] NI-11593, pp. 2 and 4.

[466] Cf. C. Mattogno, *Olocausto...*, op. cit. (note 11), p. 51.

[467] C. Mattogno, “*Medico ad Auschwitz*”: *anatomia di un falso*, Edizioni La Sfinge, Parma 1988.

[468] In this respect, cf. C. Mattogno, *Auschwitz: un caso di plagio*, Edizioni La Sfinge, Parma 1986; Engl.: “Auschwitz: A Case of Plagiarism,” *Journal of Historical Review*, 10(1) (1990), pp. 5-24.

[469] In this respect, cf. my article “The Elusive Holes of Death” starting on p. 279 of this book, especially chapter page 2.7.2., starting on p. 303. It was first published in English in *The Revisionist* as three separate papers: C. Mattogno, ““No Holes, No Gas Chamber(s),”” *The Revisionist* 2(3) (2004), pp. 387-410; C. Mattogno, “The Openings for the Introduction of Zyklon B,” 2 parts, *The Revisionist* 2(3) (2004), pp. 411-436.

[470] Rijksinstituut voor Oorlogsdocumentatie, Amsterdam, c[21]96 (“*die Leichen verbrannten in etwa 4 Minuten*”); cf. L. Poliakov, *Auschwitz*, Julliard, Paris 1964, p. 162.

[471] Jadwiga Bezwinska, Danuta Czech (eds.), *Inmitten des grauenvollen Verbrechens. Handschriften von Mitgliedern des Sonderkommandos*, Verlag des Staatlichen Auschwitz-Birkenau Museums, 1996, p. 37 (“in one of these ovens 12 corpses could be accomodated”).

[472] Miklos Nyiszli, op. cit. (note 14), p. 44: “This meant that several thousand people could be cremated in a single day.” This translation falsifies the original text which clearly sets out the figure “20,000,” repeated immediately following as “*húszezer*,” i.e. “twenty thousand” (again falsely translated as “several thousand”). Nyiszli Miklos, *Dr. Mengele boncolóorvosa voltam az auschwitz-i krematóriumban*,

Oradea, Nagyváradi, 1946, p. 38.

[473] *Olocausto: dilettanti nel web*, Effepi, Genova 2005, pp. 63-65;
“Auschwitz 27 gennaio 1945...,” op. cit. (note 11), pp. 47f.

[474] For the text see:
www.vho.org/aaargh/engl/RassArch/PRdebunk/PRdebunkIntro.html.

[475] PS-2170, p. 5.

[476] Martin Gilbert, *Final Journey: The Fate of the Jews in Nazi Europe*, Mayflower Books, New York 1979, p. 91.

[477] Leon Poliakov, too, has falsified the 25 m² in the original document, by writing 93 m² instead. *Breviaire de la haine*, Calmann-Lévy, Paris 1979, p. 223.

[478] See www.vho.org/GB/c/DC/censtraitor.html

[479] PS-1553.

[480] In this respect cf. C. Mattogno, “The Crematoria Ovens of Auschwitz and Birkenau,” in: Germar Rudolf (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust. The Growing Critique of “Truth” and “Memory,”* 2nd ed., Theses and Dissertations Press, Chicago, 2003, pp. 373-412 (the first edition of this volume appeared in 2000, edited by G. Rudolf under the pen name Ernst Gauss).

[481] Cf. my article “An Accountant Poses as Cremation Expert” beginning at p. 87 in this book (a previous version is online at www.vho.org/GB/c/CM/Risposta-new-eng.html).

[482] Germar Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report. Expert Report on Chemical and Technical Aspects of the ‘Gas Chambers’ of Auschwitz*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003. The first German edition appeared in 1993: Rüdiger Kammerer, Armin Solms (eds.), *Das Rudolf Gutachten*, Cromwell Press, London 1993; 2nd ed.: *Das Rudolf Gutachten*, Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings 2001.

[483] See the new edition: Fred A. Leuchter, Robert Faurisson, Germar Rudolf, *The Leuchter Reports. Critical Edition*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2005.

[484] In this respect cf. my study *Olocausto...*, op. cit. (note 11), pp. 154f.

[485] Cf. the photographic album *Majdanek*, Krajowa Agencja Wydawnicza, Lublin 1985, photograph 67.

[486] J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and operation of the gas chambers*, The Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, New York 1989, pp. 59f. (<http://holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/pressac/technique-and-operation/pressac0059.shtml>).

[487] G. Rudolf, 2003, op. cit. (note 32), pp. 170-180.

[488] D. Dwork, R.J. van Pelt, *Auschwitz 1270 to the present*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York, London 1996, p. 364.

[489] David Cole, Bradley Smith, *David Cole Interviews Dr. Franciszek Piper, Director, Auschwitz State Museum*, VHS Video, 1992, distributed by CODOH, P.O. Box 439016, San Diego, CA 92143, USA (www.vho.org/GB/c/DC/gcgvcole.html); *Journal of Historical Review* 13(2) (1993), pp. 11-13.

- [490] E. Conan, "Auschwitz: la mémoire du mal," in: *L'Express*, January 19, 1995, p. 57: "Pour l'instant, on la laisse en l'état et on ne précise rien au visiteur. C'est trop compliqué" (www.fpp.co.uk/Auschwitz/docs/Conan.html).
- [491] APMO (Archive of the National Museum of Auschwitz-Birkenau), BW 30/34, p. 100.
- [492] In this respect cf. my article "The Morgues of the Crematoria at Birkenau in the Light of Documents," *The Revisionist*, 2(3) (2004), pp. 271-294.
- [493] J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz...*, op. cit. (note 36), p. 503.
- [494] APMO, BW 30/34, p. 49.
- [495] J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz...*, op. cit. (note 36), pp. 452f.
- [496] *Ibid.*, p. 46.
- [497] *Ibid.*, photograph 15.
- [498] *Ibid.*, pp. 28f.
- [499] "Dienstanweisung für die Bedienung der Blausäure-Entwesungskammer im K.L.M. Unterkunft Gusen," Öffentliches Denkmal und Museum Mauthausen. Archiv, M 9a/1.
- [500] H. Langbein, *Der Auschwitz-Prozess. Eine Dokumentation*, Europa Verlag, Vienna 1965, p. 537.
- [501] *Ibid.*, p. 539.
- [502] During the trial Pery Broad was heavily incriminated by several witnesses to have committed severe crimes. He was therefore arrested on May 30, 1959, and kept in custody during the ongoing investigations and the entire trial itself, which commenced in 1964. On August 20, 1965, he was sentenced by the Frankfurt District Court to four years imprisonment, which was considered served with the time he had spent in jail since 1959. His sentence was for 22 counts of participation in selections and executions, that is to say, for collective assistance to collective murder. And so in Frankfurt the convicted mass murderer Pery Broad left the courtroom as a free man, just as he had after the war; cf. G. Rudolf, "From the Files of the Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial, Part 5," *The Revisionist* 2(2) (2004), pp. 219-224, here 223f.; *ibid.*, "...Part 6," *TR*, 2(3) (2004), pp. 327-330, here p. 330; cf. also *ibid.*, Part 7, *TR* 3(1&2) (2005), in preparation. Editor's remark.
- [503] P. Vidal-Naquet, *Gli assassini della memoria*, Editori Riuniti, Roma 1993, p. 27.
- [504] J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz...*, op. cit. (note 36), p. 162.
- [505] J.-C. Pressac, *Les crématoires d'Auschwitz. La machinerie du meurtre de masse*, CNRS Éditions, Paris 1993, p. 131.
- [506] How is Broad, who made his statement in 1945, supposed to have known about Rudolf Höss's confession extorted a year later? Editor's remark.
- [507] Martin Broszat (ed.), *Kommandant in Auschwitz. Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen des Rudolf Höss*, DTV, Munich 1981, p. 149, and note 1.
- [508] R. Faurisson, "How the British Obtained the Confessions of Rudolf

Höss,” *Journal of Historical Review* 7(4) (1986), pp. 389-403.

[509] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 55), p. 131.

[510] F. Meyer, “Die Zahl der Opfer von Auschwitz. Neue Erkenntnisse durch neue Archivfunde,” *Osteuropa. Zeitschrift für Gegenwartsfragen des Ostens*, no. 5, May 2002, p. 639 (www.vho.org/D/Beitraege/FritjofMeyerOsteuropa.html; Engl.: www.vho.org/GB/c/Meyer.html).

[511] C. Mattogno, op. cit. (note 13), pp. 75-87.

[512] GARF (Gosudarstvenni Archiv Rossiskoi Federatsii: State Archive of the Russian Federation), Moscow, 7021-108-39, p. 67.

[513] M. Gilbert, *Auschwitz & the Allies. The Politics of Rescue*, Arrow Books Limited, London 1984, p. 338.

[514] See in this regard my study mentioned previously “Auschwitz 27 gennaio 1945...,” op. cit. (note 11).

[515] Ernst Gauss, *Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte. Strittige Fragen im Kreuzverhör*, Grabert Verlag, Tübingen 1993, pp. 104-107. Jean-Marie Boisdefeu, *La controverse sur l’extermination des Juifs par les Allemands*, Vrij Historisch Onderzoek, Anvers 1996, Vol I, pp. 162-165.

[516] J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz...*, op. cit. (note 36), p. 253.

[517] Mission: 60 PRS/462 SQ. Exposure : 3056. Can : D 1508, 31 May 1944, NA; in this respect, see chapter 2: “No Holes, No Gas Chamber(s)” of my contribution “The Elusive Holes of Death“ starting on p. 282 of this book. It was first published in English in *The Revisionist*, 2(4) (2004), pp. 387-410. The photograph dated May 31, 1944, is shown on p. 318 of this book. The aerial photographs are examined starting on p. 290.

[518] C.D. Provan, *No Holes? No Holocaust? A Study of the Holes in the Roof of Leichenkeller 1 of Krematorium 2 at Birkenau*, Zimmer Printing, Monongahela, PA, 2000, p. 13.

[519] J.-M. Boisdefeu, op. cit. (note 65), pp. 166-170.

[520] C.D. Provan, op. cit. (note 68), p. 33; cf. also p. 18.

[521] See chapter 4, “Detailed Study of Crematorium II” of my paper “The Elusive Holes of Death“ starting on p. 360 of this book, first published as “The Openings for the Introduction of Zyklon B – Part II: Crematorium II,” *The Revisionist* 2(4) (2004), pp. 420-436.

[522] Anne Freyer, Jean-Claude Pressac (eds.), *L’Album d’Auschwitz*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris 1983, pp. 194, 198-203.

[523] Cf. my article “Die Deportation ungarischer Juden von Mai bis Juli 1944. Eine provisorische Bilanz,” *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, 5(4) (2001), pp. 388-389.

[524] E. Springer, *Il silenzio dei vivi*. Marsilio, Venezia 1997, pp. 67-70.

[525] In this respect cf. my chapter “Una testimone dell’ultima ora: Elisa

Springer,” in: *Olocausto...*, op. cit. (note 11), pp. 138f.

[526] C. Mattogno, op. cit. (note 73), p. 387.

[527] SS-Obersturmführer (First Lieutenant, not Lieutenant Colonel!) Werner Jothann was head of the Central Construction Office at Auschwitz. He had succeeded the previous head, SS-Sturmbannführer Bischoff, on October 1, 1943.

[528] Jothann’s “*Dringendes Telegramm*” of May 12, 1944, reads: “Installation of the 2 lifts can not [sic!] be done,” J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 55), p. 89, p. 100.

[529] F. Piper, “Gas Chambers and Crematoria,” in: I. Gutman, M. Berenbaum (eds.), *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington/Indianapolis 1994, p. 173.

[530] J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz...*, op. cit. (note 36), p. 500.

[531] F. Müller, *Sonderbehandlung. Drei Jahre in den Krematorien und Gaskammern von Auschwitz*, Verlag Steinhausen, Munich 1979, p. 207 and 211.

[532] Raymond Philips (ed.), op. cit. (note 10), p. 131.

[533] F. Müller, op. cit. (note 81), p. 231.

[534] M. Nyiszli, *Auschwitz...*, op. cit. (note 14), pp. 68-71.

[535] D. Czech, *Kalendarium der Ereignisse im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz-Birkenau 1939-1945*. Rowohlt Verlag, Reinbek bei Hamburg 1989, p. 789.

[536] A. Strzelecki, “The Plunder of Victims and Their Corpses,” in: I. Gutman, M. Berenbaum (eds.), op. cit. (note 79), p. 258.

[537] Sprawozdanie okresowe /od 25 V 1944 – 15 VI 1944/. APMO, D-RO/91, Vol. VII, p. 446.

[538] Cf. e.g. F. Piper, op. cit. (note 79), p. 173.

[539] NG-5623.

[540] T-1163 (Document 1319 of the Israeli police).

[541] C. Mattogno, *Auschwitz. Holocaust Revisionist Jean-Claude Pressac. The “Gassed” People of Auschwitz: Pressac’s New Revisions*, Granata, Palos Verdes 1995, pp. 16f.

[542] C. Mattogno, op. cit. (note 30), p. 398.

[543] Actually, the volume would be higher because the excavated earth increases in volume by about 25 percent. G. Colombo, *Manuale dell’ingegnere*, Hoepli, Milano 1916, p. 190.

[544] Based on about 200 kg per corpse. Cf. the study on the alleged mass cremation at Treblinka in: C. Mattogno, J. Graf, *Treblinka*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2004, pp. 145-153, in particular p. 151f.

[545] In this respect, C. Mattogno, op. cit. (note 13), pp. 15-26 (“The Himmler Visit to Auschwitz”) and the relative documents on pp. 108-112.

[546] J. Graf, C. Mattogno, *Concentration Camp Majdanek*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003; the German edition appeared in 1998 (*KL Majdanek. Eine historische und technische Studie*, Castle Hill Publisher, Hastings 1998).

- [547] Ibid., Chapter VI, “*The Gas Chambers*,” pp. 119-159.
- [548] C. Mattogno, “The Gas Chambers of Majdanek,” in: G. Rudolf (ed.), op. cit. (note 30), pp. 413-434.
- [549] J. Graf, C. Mattogno, op. cit. (note 96), chapter VI.2, “Design, Construction and Purpose of the Gas Chambers,” pp. 128-138.
- [550] Ibid., chapter VI.3, “Using the Gas Chambers to Kill Human Beings,” pp. 138-154.
- [551] Ibid., p. 153. The quotation is taken from the article by J.-C. Pressac, “Les carences et incohérences du rapport Leuchter,” in: *Journal J*, December 1988, p. IX.
- [552] J. Graf, C. Mattogno, op. cit. (note 96), photograph XXI on p. 311.
- [553] Cz. Rajca, “Eksterminacja bezpośrednia,” in: T. Mencil (ed.), *Majdanek 1941-1944*, Wydawnictwo Lubelskie, Lublino 1991, p. 270.
- [554] J. Graf, C. Mattogno, op. cit. (note 96), photograph X on p. 305.
- [555] www.ntskeptics.org/2002/2002december/shermergeivett.jpg
- [556] Sign seen and photographed by me in June of 1997.
- [557] J. Graf, C. Mattogno, op. cit. (note 96), pp. 149-153.
- [558] Only one of the two doors closed towards the inside (the one on the south side), furthermore, as I have already noted, the gas-tight doors did not have “locks” but locking levers (each door of chamber IV had three of those). Cf. the color photographs outside of the text in the book *Concentration Camp Majdanek*, op. cit. (note 96).
- [559] The plan is reproduced in: J. Graf, C. Mattogno, op. cit. (note 96), document 31, p. 288.
- [560] Cf. the color photographs of the doors of these rooms in my article “Auschwitz: The Samuel Crowell Bomb Shelter Thesis: A Historically Unfounded Hypothesis,” online: www.vho.org/GB/c/CM/Crowell-final-eng.html.
- [561] The gas testing device for Zyklon B residues, called *Gasrest-Nachweisgerät für Zyklon B* was a chemical apparatus using chemicals and paper indicators. The description and a photograph of such a device are given in my study “Auschwitz: The End of a Legend,” in: G. Rudolf (ed.), *Auschwitz: Plain Facts*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2005, pp. 160f and 182-186; see also my paper “The ‘Gas Testers’ of Auschwitz” in *The Revisionist*, 2(2) (2004), pp. 140-154.
- [562] The author inspected and photographed the door in 1997. A color photograph is reproduced in op. cit. (note 110), Fig. 8 (and 9, an enlargement).
- [563] J. Graf, C. Mattogno, op. cit. (note 96), chapter VIII, “Zyklon B Deliveries to the Concentration Camp Majdanek,” pp. 193-208. Cf. in particular the summary table on p. 204.
- [564] Ibid., p. 145. On-site inspection by the author and confirming letter from the director of the archive of the Museum of Majdanek sent to the author on January 30, 1998.
- [565] On-site measurements by the author.

- [566] H. Maršàlek, *Die Geschichte des Konzentrationslagers Mauthausen. Dokumentation*, Österreichische Lagergemeinschaft Mauthausen, Vienna 1980, p. 211.
- [567] H. Maršàlek, *Die Vergasungsaktionen im Konzentrationslager Mauthausen*, Österreichische Lagergemeinschaft Mauthausen, Vienna 1988, p. 10.
- [568] Since mixtures of hydrogen cyanide and air with more than 6 vol.% of HCN are explosive, Zyklon B spread directly onto a red-hot brick would have led to an explosion of the device, not to a successful gassing. Editor's remark.
- [569] C. Mattogno, "KL Sachsenhausen: Stärkemeldungen und 'Vernichtungsaktionen' 1940 bis 1945," in: *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, 7(2) (2003), pp. 173-185.
- [570] 1937 and 1940-1944. *Konzentrationslager Buchenwald. Bericht des internationalen Lagerkomitees Buchenwald*, Weimar undated, pp. 84f.
- [571] G. Neuhäusler, *Wie war das im KZ Dachau?*, Karmel Heilig Blut Dachau, Munich 1981, p. 27.
- [572] H. Maršàlek, op. cit. (note 116), pp. 156-158.
- [573] www.fasspr.com/fsb/images/AlexGrobman.jpg
- [574] *IMT* document PS-3762; *IMT*, vol. XXXII, p. 68.
- [575] C.R. Browning, "La décision concernant la solution finale," in: Colloque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (ed.), *L'Allemagne nazie et le génocide juif*, Gallimard-Le Seuil, Paris 1985, p. 198.
- [576] T-394 (document 1209 of the Israeli police)
- [577] PS-709; NG-2586-F.
- [578] C. Mattogno, J. Graf, *Treblinka*, op. cit. (note 94), chapter VII, pp. 203-231.
- [579] "Richtlinien für die Führung der Wirtschaft in den besetzten Ostgebieten" (Grüne Mappe), Berlin, September 1942. EC-347. *Der Prozess gegen die Hauptkriegsverbrecher vor dem internationalen Militärgerichtshof (IMG)*, Nuremberg 1948, vol. XXXVI, p. 348.
- [580] This photo is reproduced in the appendix to my book *Olocausto: dilettanti nel web*, op. cit. (note 23).
- [581] W. Benz (ed.), *Dimension des Völkermords. Die Zahl der jüdischen Opfer des Nationalsozialismus*, R. Oldenbourg Verlag, Munich 1991.
- [582] W.N. Sanning, *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry*, Institute for Historical Review, Torrance, California, 1983.
- [583] G. Rudolf, "Holocaust Victims: A Statistical Analysis. W. Benz and W.N. Sanning – A Comparison," in: G. Rudolf (ed.), op. cit. (note 30), pp. 183-216.
- [584] Ibid., p. 203.
- [585] Ibid., pp. 205f.
- [586] R. Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, Holmes & Meyer, New York 1985, p. 1219.

- [587] F. Piper, *Die Zahl der Opfer von Auschwitz*, Verlag des Staatlichen Museums in Oświęcim, 1993, p. 202.
- [588] Although it is true that Polish historiography never claimed that all four million Auschwitz victims were Jews, the witnesses, for instance H. Tauber, reported about four million people having been “gassed,” and it is claimed that almost exclusively Jews have been gassed.
- [589] W. Benz (ed.), op. cit. (note 131), p. 16.
- [590] R. Hilberg, op. cit. (note 136), p. 1218.
- [591] NO-5196, p. 4.
- [592] Beate Klarsfeld, S. Klarsfeld (eds.), *Le mémorial de la déportation des Juifs de France*, publ. by the editors, Paris 1978, p. 10 (my numbering).
- [593] “Statystyka ludności żydowskiej w Polsce,” in: *Biuletyn Głównej Komisji Badania Zbrodni Niemieckich w Polsce*, I, 1946, p. 203.
- [594] NG-2586-G. Photocopy of the original in: R.M. Kempner, *Eichmann und Komplizen*, Europa Verlag, Zürich 1961, pp. 133-147.
- [595] Ibid., p. 3 of the original.
- [596] Ibid., p. 4 of the original.
- [597] Cf. C. Mattogno, J. Graf, *Treblinka*, op. cit. (note 94), chapter VI, “National-Socialist Policy of Jewish Emigration,” pp. 179-201.
- [598] Ibid., pp. 242-245.
- [599] NG-2586-G, p. 5 of the original.
- [600] Ibid., p. 8 of the original.
- [601] Ibid.: “*Es ist beabsichtigt, Juden im Alter von über 65 Jahren nicht zu evakuieren, sondern sie einem Altersghetto – vorgesehen ist Theresienstadt – zu überstellen.*”
- [602] For the text of the document and its historical setting cf.: C. Mattogno, J. Graf, *Treblinka*, op. cit. (note 94), pp. 194-196.
- [603] German Historian Peter Witte as quoted by Shermer and Grobman.
- [604] Max Domarus, *Hitler Reden und Proklamationen 1932-1945*, R. Löwit, Wiesbaden 1973, vol II, second part, p. 1058: “*sondern die Vernichtung der jüdischen Rasse in Europa.*”
- [605] Ibid., p. 1663: “*das gesamte Judentum seine Rolle in Europa ausgespielt haben wird!*”
- [606] Ibid., p. 1828f.
- [607] Ibid., p. 1844: “*nicht die arische Menschheit vernichtet, sondern der Jude ausgerottet wird.*”
- [608] H. Picker, *Hitlers Tischgespräche im Führerhauptquartier*, Wilhelm Goldmann Verlag, Munich 1981, p. 449: “*Denn – da er [Hitler] mit Beendigung dieses Krieges auch den letzten Juden aus Europa hinausgeworfen haben werde – wäre dann*

die kommunistische Gefahr aus dem Osten mit Stumpf und Stiel ausgerottet.”

[609] Max Domarus, op. cit. (note 154), p. 1920.

[610] Ibid., p. 1937.

[611] Ibid., p. 1992.

[612] Joseph Billig, *La solution finale de la question juive*, Klarsfeld, Paris 1977, p. 51.

[613] IMG, op. cit. (note 129), vol. XXIX, pp. 415f.

[614] Ibid., p. 503.

[615] Recte: “from the Reich” (“*vom Reich her*”).

[616] Martin Broszat, “Hitler und die Genesis der ‘Endlösung.’ Aus Anlass der Thesen von David Irving,” in: *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, no. 25/4, 1977, p. 748f.

[617] Jüdisches Historisches Institut Warschau (ed.), *Faschismus – Getto – Massenmord*, Röderberg-Verlag, Frankfurt/Main 1960, p. 252.

[618] A clear reference to the proposal made by SS-Sturmbannführer Carltheo Zeitschel on August 22, 1941 – later approved by the *Führer* – to resolve the “Jewish question” by deporting the Jews under German jurisdiction to the eastern occupied territories (Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine, V-15). Cf. C. Mattogno, J. Graf, *Treblinka*, op. cit. (note 94), pp. 184f.

[619] M. Broszat, op. cit. (note 166), p. 749f.: “*Der Führer ist der Überzeugung, daß seine damalige Prophezeiung im Reichstag, daß, wenn es dem Judentum gelänge, noch einmal einen Krieg zu provozieren, er mit der Vernichtung der Juden enden würde, sich bestätigt.*”

[620] Richard Harwood, *Did Six Million Really Die?*, Historical Review Press, Richmond, Surrey, 1974.

[621] M. Broszat, op. cit. (note 166), p. 750.

[622] Ibid., p. 751.

[623] Ibid., p. 758.

[624] R. Manvell, H. Fraenkel, *Goebbels, eine Biographie*, Verlag Kiepenheuer & Witsch, Köln/Berlin 1960, p. 256.

[625] Cf. C. Mattogno, J. Graf, *Treblinka*, op. cit. (note 94), pp. 233-245.

[626] Dr. Józef Kermisz, *Dokumenty i materiały do dziejów okupacji niemieckiej w Polsce*, vol. II, “Akcje” i “Wysiedlenia,” Warszawa-Łódź-Kraków, 1946, p. 10.

[627] Ibid., p. 11.

[628] Ibid., p. 15.

[629] Ibid., p. 46.

[630] With the exception of a few thousand Jews “selected” for the operation of the camps themselves.

- [631] Ibid., pp. 32f.
- [632] In this respect cf. my study *Belzec in Propaganda, Testimonies, Archeological Research, and History*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2004.
- [633] M. Broszat (ed.), op. cit. (note 57), p. 157.
- [634] PS-1919. *IMG*, op. cit. (note 129), vol. XXIX, p. 145. On p. 192, the authors present the original text: “*Ich meine jetzt die Judenevakuierung, die Ausrottung des jüdischen Volkes*”
- [635] C. Mattogno, J. Graf, *Treblinka*, op. cit. (note 94), chapter IX, pp. 275-299. According to the Strop report, 7,564 Jewish fighters were killed on the spot in the uprising of the Warsaw ghetto (April 1943). Ibid., pp. 283f.
- [636] G. Rudolf, *Lectures on the Holocaust*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, chapter 4.1., pp. 342-444.
- [637] Bradley F. Smith, Agnes F. Peterson (ed.), *Heinrich Himmler. Geheimreden 1933 bis 1945 und andere Ansprachen*, Propyläen Verlag, Frankfurt/Main 1974, p. 200.
- [638] See D. Irving, *La guerra di Hitler*, Edizioni Settimo Sigillo, Roma 2001, pp. 539f.
- [639] H. Picker, op. cit. (note 158), p. 189 (July 24, 1942).
- [640] Ibid., p. 340 (May 29, 1942).
- [641] W. Jochmann (ed.), *Adolf Hitler. Monologe im Führerhauptquartier 1941-1944. Die Aufzeichnungen*, Albrecht Knaus, Hamburg 1980, p. 241 (“The Jew has to go away from Europe. The best thing is for them to go to Russia,” January 27, 1942).
- [642] Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918-1945, Series D, Vol. X, London 1957, p. 484.
- [643] PS-4025.
- [644] This refers to the German project of 1941 to deport Jews into the swamps of the Pripyet area of Russia. Cfr. Götz Aly, “*Endlösung.*” *Völkerverschiebung und der Mord an den Juden*, S. Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt/Main 1995, pp. 273-276.
- [645] RGVA (*Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennii Vojennii Archiv*: Russian State War Archive), 500-4-92, p. 64.
- [646] Cf. for this “Commission try to defuse Auschwitz controversy,” *The Canadian Jewish News*, Oct. 3, 1990, p. 5.
- [647] Daily press of July 18, 1990, e.g.: Krzysztof Leski, Ohad Gozani, “Poland reduces Auschwitz death toll estimate to 1 million,” *London Daily Telegraph*, July 18, 1990; UPI, “Poland lowers Auschwitz toll,” *Toronto Sun*, July 18, 1990. In Germany, it was the left-wing radical daily newspaper *die tageszeitung* which published the lowest new victim figure on July 18, 1990: 960.000.
- [648] “‘Ich empfinde Verlegenheit.’ Der polnische Publizist Ernest Skalski über die neue Auschwitz-Diskussion in Warschau” (“I feel embarrassed.” the Polish author Ernest Skalski about the new Auschwitz discussion in Warsaw), *Der Spiegel* no. 30

(1990), p. 111.

[649] “Total of the deaths: 775,000 (but this figure can be attended with gaps. This is why the global figure of 800,000 victims should be retained currently,” Jean-Claude Pressac, *Les Crématoires d’Auschwitz. La Machinerie du meurtre de masse*, éditions du CNRS, 1993, p. 148.

[650] “Total of the deaths: 631,000-711,000; [...] the number of the victims is evaluated at 630,000 to 710,000”; German translation of the work referred to in the previous note: *Die Krematorien von Auschwitz. Die Technik des Massenmordes*, Munich, Piper, 1994, p. 202.

[651] www.auschwitz.org.pl/html/eng/aktualnosci/news_big.php?id=564

[652] www.idgr.de/texte/geschichte/ns-verbrechen/fritjof-meyer/meyer-replik-auf-piper.php.

[653] www.idgr.de/texte/geschichte/ns-verbrechen/fritjof-meyer/index.php

[654] Germar Rudolf, “Cautious Mainstream revisionism,” *The Revisionist* 1(1) (2003), pp. 23-30; Carlo Mattogno, “Auschwitz. Fritjof Meyer’s New Revisions,” *ibid.*, pp. 30-37.

[655] C. Mattogno, “On the Piper-Meyer-Controversy: Soviet Propaganda vs. Pseudo-revisionism,” *The Revisionist* 2(2) (2004), pp. 131-139.

[656] Jürgen Graf, “‘Just Call Me Meyer’ – A Farewell to ‘Obviousness’,” *The Revisionist* 2(2) (2004), pp. 127-130.

[657] John C. Zimmerman, “Fritjof Meyer and the number of Auschwitz victims: a critical analysis,” *Journal of Genocide Research*, 6(2) (2004), pp. 249-266. This paper was positively mentioned by Sven Felix Kellerhoff, “Interpretationen und Ideologie,” in the German daily *Die Welt*, Sept. 21, 2004.

[658] *Holocaust Denial. Demographics, Testimonies, and Ideologies*, University Press of America, Lanham, MD, 2000.

[659] “An Accountant Poses as Cremation Expert,” starting on p. 87.

[660] Lieutenant Colonel Ferency, Representative of the Hungarian Secretary of State for the deportation of Jews, IMT, Blue Series, Vol. 4, p. 367.

[661] *Concentration Camp Stutthof and its Function in National Sozialistischen Jewish Politics*, 2nd ed., Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2004, pp. 91-95.

[662] See www.holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/body-disposal/~auschwitz/response-to-mattogno/. Mattogno’s replies to this are printed in this volume, “An Accountant Poses as Cremation Expert,” starting at p. 87. The original internet papers are posted at www.vho.org/GB/c/CM/jcz.html; www.vho.org/GB/c/CM/Risposta-new-eng.html.

[663] The gaps of the grills of the Birkenau ovens were only 50 mm wide, so that corpses had to almost completely incinerate before their remainders fell through the grill into the post-combustion chamber, making room for the next load of corpses.

[664] See my analysis in *Lectures on the Holocaust*, Theses & Dissertations

Press, Chicago 2005, pp. 451-456; see also my contribution about J.-C. Pressac in this book, pp. 25f.

[665] Taken from J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, New York 1989, p. 259, section enlargement (<http://holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/pressac/technique-and-operation/pressac0259.shtml>).

[666] For a more complete discussion see the works quoted in previous footnote.

[667] See C. Mattogno's explanations in this book in his chapter "9. Multiple Cremations," on p. 148.

[668] APMO, Neg. Nr. 291, section.

[669] US Army Audio-Visual Agency, SC 263997, section.

[670] The lack of any smoke from the crematory chimneys in Allied and German air photos during spring and summer 1944 indicates indeed that those crematories were inoperable for extended periods of times during this time, which Zimmerman doubts; see C. Mattogno's elaborations on this in *Auschwitz: Open Air Incinerations*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2005.

[671] They are called "Heizer" (stoker); C. Mattogno, *Special Treatment in Auschwitz*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2004, pp. 101ff.

[672] Cf. C. Mattogno, "The Morgues of the Crematoria at Birkenau in the Light of Documents," *TR* 2(3) (2004), pp. 271-294.

[673] G. Rudolf, "England's Keele University Spreads Holocaust Propaganda," *The Revisionist*, 2(4) (2004), pp. 444f.

[674] R. Höss, in: M. Broszat (ed.), *Kommandant in Auschwitz*, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, Stuttgart 1958, p. 151.

[675] More about that in my expert report, *The Rudolf Report*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003, pp. 199-201.

[676] F. Meyer, "Die Zahl der Opfer von Auschwitz. Neue Erkenntnisse durch neue Archivfunde," in: *Osteuropa. Zeitschrift für Gegenwartsfragen des Ostens*, No. 5, May 2002, pp. 631-641; for an English translation see online www.vho.org/GB/c/Meyer.html.

[677] See the previous contribution in the present volume "The International Auschwitz Controversy," starting at p. 269, for more details and references.

[678] www.idgr.de/texte/geschichte/ns-verbrechen/fritjof-meyer/meyer-040212.php

[679] Cf. especially Carlo Mattogno, "The Morgues of the Crematoria at Birkenau in the Light of Documents," *TR* 2(3) (2004), pp. 271-294.

[680] Carlo Mattogno, "Keine Löcher, keine Gaskammer(n)," *VffG* 6(3) (2002), pp. 284-304; Engl. see chapter 2 of "The Elusive Holes of Death" starting on p. 282 of this book. First published in English as "No Holes, No Gas Chamber(s)" in: *The*

Revisionist, 2(4) (2004), pp. 387-410.

[681] E.g. in Germar Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2003, pp. 113-120.

[682] Charles D. Provan, *No Holes? No Holocaust? A Study of the Holes in the Roof of morgue 1 of Krematorium II at Birkenau*, self-published, Zimmer Printing, 410 West Main Street, Monongahela, PA 15063, 2000; online: www.revisingrevisionism.com.

[683] D. Keren, J. McCarthy, H.W. Mazal, "The Ruins of the Gas Chambers: A Forensic Investigation of Crematoriums at Auschwitz I and Auschwitz-Birkenau," in: *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, 9(1) (2004), pp. 68-103; cf. their website www.holocaust-history.org.

[684] During the years 2002 and 2003 on the website of Russ Granata, which does no longer exist; now this paper is posted at www.vho.org/GB/c/CM/noholes.html. It is an earlier version of the revised paper in this book, op. cit. (note 5).

[685] See my paper "Green sees Red" in this book starting at p. 69.

[686] First published as "Keine Löcher, keine Gaskammer(n)," *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, 6(3) (2002), S. 284-304; translated by Russ Granata; first Engl. publication as "No Holes, no gas chamber(s)" in: *The Revisionist* 2(4) (2004), pp. 387-410; slightly revised version.

Ditlieb Felderer, "Auschwitz Notebook Part 2: Lids and Openings," *JHR* 1(3) (1980), pp. 255-266.

[687] R. Kammerer, A. Solms (ed.), *Das Rudolf Gutachten*, Cromwell Press, London 1993, pp. 22-29; Engl.: G. Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003, pp. 113-134.

[688] Op. cit. (note 7). Ch. Provan distributed this spiral-bound, photocopied brochure for the first time in June 2000 during the 13th IHR conference in Irvine, California, and has posted it subsequently on the Internet: www.revisingrevisionism.com; the following page numbers refer to the photocopied edition. The slogan "No Holes, No Holocaust" is attributed to Robert Faurisson.

[689] Royal Courts of Justice, verdict of Justice Gray of April 11, 2000, points 7.91-7.94 (www.holocaustdenialontrial.com/).

[690] University of California Press, Berkeley Los Angeles, 1994, pp. 187f.

[691] Ibid., p. 188.

[692] Limes Verlag, Wiesbaden/Munich 1982, p. 204.

[693] A member of the "Zimmerman Aid Committee" claims that my conclusion is misleading. I answered this absurd accusation in C. Mattogno, *Olocausto: dilettanti nel web*, Effepi, Genova 2005, pp. 22-25.

[694] Plan 933 of January 19, 1944, in J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and Operation of the Gas Chambers*, The Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, New York 1989, pp. 280f. (<http://holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/pressac/technique-and-operation/pressac0280.shtml>).

- [695] *IMT*, vol. XX, p. 449.
- [696] *Ibid.*, p. 503.
- [697] *Ibid.*, p. 504.
- [698] Bendel called himself “Charles Sigismund.” Another member of the “Zimmerman Aid Committee” incredibly suggested that there are two different Bendel witnesses, one with the name “Paul,” the other with the name “Charles Sigismund”! Cf. C. Mattogno, *op. cit.* (note 8), p. 53.
- [699] *Témoignages sur Auschwitz*, Paris 1946, p. 161.
- [700] J.-C. Pressac, *op. cit.* (note 9), p. 286.
- [701] NI-11953. Interrogation of March 2, 1946.
- [702] NI-11390.
- [703] The ceiling of morgue 2 was 2.30 m high. J.-C. Pressac, *op. cit.* (note 9), p. 286.
- [704] *Dr. Mengele boncolóorvosa voltam az auschwitz-i krematóriumban*, Copyright by Dr. Nyiszli Miklos, Oradea, Nagyvárad, 1946.
- [705] *Auschwitz. A Doctor's Eyewitness Account*, Fawcett Crest, New York 1961, p. 44f.
- [706] It concerns morgue 2, the alleged “undressing room.”
- [707] In the Hungarian original, *op. cit.* (note 19), p. 33: “length about 200 meters.”
- [708] Morgue 1, the alleged “gas chamber. “
- [709] In the Hungarian original, *op. cit.* (note 19), p. 34: “This room has the same size as the undressing room.”
- [710] In the Hungarian original, *op. cit.* (note 19), p. 35: “30 meters, the one from the other.”
- [711] J.-C. Pressac, *op. cit.* (note 9), p. 286.
- [712] M. Nyiszli, *op. cit.* (note 20), p. 47; *op. cit.* (note 19), p. 37.
- [713] M. Nyiszli, *op. cit.* (note 20), p. 43; *op. cit.* (note 19), p. 32.
- [714] M. Nyiszli, *op. cit.* (note 20), p. 149.
- [715] *Ibid.*, p. 37. After November 18, 1944, Nyiszli was transferred from Crematorium II to Crematorium V. *Ibid.*, p. 139 and 146.
- [716] Provan tried to justify Nyiszli's errors by claiming that this book is a novel without historical value: C.D. Provan, *Journal of Historical Review*, 20(1) (2001), pp. 20-29, but his explanation is untenable; see my remarks in “Vulgärer Berufsbetrüger” in: *VffG* 6(2) (2002), pp. 231f.
- [717] C.S. Bendel, *op. cit.* (note 14), pp. 161f.
- [718] This assertion is not a “confirmation” of the claim that *Leichenkeller* 1 of crematory II had been divided in two rooms (as Tauber claims), because Bendel claims that every crematory had two gas chambers: “In each crematorium there were generally

two gas chambers.” Raymond Philips (ed.), *Trial of Josef Kramer and Forty-four Others (The Belsen Trial)*, William Hodge and Company Limited, London/Edinburgh/Glasgow 1946, p. 135.

[719] For a more general critique of Nyiszli’s statement see C. Mattogno, “*Medico ad Auschwitz*”: *Anatomia di un falso*, Edizioni La Sfinge, Parma 1988.

[720] Filip Müller, *Sonderbehandlung. Drei Jahre in den Krematorien und Gaskammern von Auschwitz*. Verlag Steinhausen, Munich 1979, p. 96.

[721] Zyklon B was not constituted of “crystals,” but an inert support base – during the 1940s normally gypsum with a small amount of starch – soaked in hydrogen cyanide.

[722] Filip Müller, *ibid.*, p. 287.

[723] *Auschwitz: un caso di plagio*, Edizioni La Sfinge, Parma 1986; English translation: “Auschwitz: A Case of Plagiarism,” *The Journal of Historical Review*, 10(1) (1990).

[724] Barbara Kulaszka (ed.), *Did Six Million Really Die? Report of the Evidence in the Canadian “False News” Trial of Ernst Zündel – 1988*, Samisdat Publishers Ltd., Toronto 1992, p. 353.

[725] Ernst Gauss, *Vorlesungen über Zeitgeschichte. Strittige Fragen im Kreuzverhör*, Grabert Verlag, Tübingen 1993, pp. 104-107; Jean-Marie Boisdefeu, *La controverse sur l’extermination des Juifs par les Allemands*, Vrij Historisch Onderzoek, Antwerp 1996, vol. I, pp. 162-165.

[726] Mission: 60 PRS/462 SQ. Exposure 3056. Can D 1508, 31 May 1942, NA.

[727] B. Kulaszka (ed.), *op. cit* (note 39), p. 353.

[728] J.C. Ball, *Air Photo Evidence*, Ball Resource Service Ltd., Delta, B.C., Canada 1992; Ball, “Air Photo Evidence,” in: Germar Rudolf (ed.), *Dissecting the Holocaust*, 2nd ed., Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003, pp. 269-282, here p. 278f.

[729] Measurement by the author among the ruins of Morgue 1 of Crematorium II.

[730] Whoever has worked in the field of building construction knows that a thin layer of cement covering a large area, if it cannot be reinforced with a scaffolding of iron rods, inevitably tends to disintegrate.

[731] Testimony of Rudolf Höss taken at Nuremberg, Germany, on April 1, 1946, 1470 to 1730 by Mr. Sender Jaari and Lt. Whitney Harris, pp. 17-19.

[732] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[733] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

[734] *Ibid.*, p. 25. Provan cites this passage on p. 15.

[735] NO-1210.

[736] This camp never existed. It should correspond to “Sobibór,” but it is

absolutely incomprehensible how Höss could have transformed “Sobibór” into “Wolzek.”

- [737] Testimony..., op. cit. (note 46), p. 27.
- [738] PS-3868.
- [739] Danuta Czech, *Kalendarium der Ereignisse im Konzentrationslager Auschwitz-Birkenau 1939-1945*, Rowohlt Verlag, Reinbek 1989, p. 186.
- [740] J.-C. Pressac, *Les crématoires d'Auschwitz. La machinerie du meurtre de masse*, CNRS Editions, Paris 1993, p. 115.
- [741] Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein, Adalbert Rückerl et al. (eds.), *Nationalsozialistische Massentötungen durch Giftgas. Eine Dokumentation*, S. Fischer Verlag, Frankfurt/Main 1983, p. 165.
- [742] Ibid., p. 182.
- [743] Testimony..., op. cit. (note 46), p. 25.
- [744] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 55), document 9, plates.
- [745] Ibid., documents 10f. (plates).
- [746] Testimony..., op. cit. (note 46), p. 25.
- [747] Plans 936(p), 936 (r), 1173-1174(p), 1173-1174(r), 933, 933[-934], 933[-934](p), 933[-934](r), 932(p), 932(r), 934 in: J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 9), pp. 268-288.
- [748] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 9), p. 302; Pressac, op. cit. (note 55), pp. 63f.
- [749] On this, see my study *The Central Construction Office of the Waffen-SS and Police Auschwitz*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2005 (www.vho.org/GB/Books/cco).
- [750] D. Czech, op. cit. (note 54), p. 241.
- [751] R. Höss, Deposition. Krakow, January 29, 1947. NI-7183, p. 3.
- [752] The one appearing in plan 2003 of December 19, 1942.
- [753] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 9), pp. 311f.
- [754] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 9), p. 341.
- [755] Cf. the drawing of the southern façade of the crematorium 1173-1174(r) in: J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 9), pp. 274f.
- [756] G. Rudolf, *Das Rudolf Gutachten*, 2. ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings 2001, p. 88; Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report*, op. cit. (note 2), p. 125.
- [757] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 55), pp. 54 and 50.
- [758] Ibid., pp. 64f.
- [759] W.W. Norton & Company, New York London 1996.
- [760] *Auschwitz 1270 to the Present*, W.W. Norton & Company, New York London 1996, p. 324. Plan 2003 of December 19, 1942, is published by the two authors as Plate 17 in the appendix “Plates. Blueprints of Genocide.”
- [761] *Auschwitz: The End of a Legend. A Critique of J.-C. Pressac*, Institute for

Historical Review, Newport Beach, CA, 1994, pp. 55f.; republished in G. Rudolf (ed.), *Auschwitz: Plain Facts*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago, IL, 2005, pp. 150f.: Plan 2136 of Central Construction Office of February 22, 1943, for crematorium III: J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 9), p. 305; Plan 2197 of Central Construction Office of March 18, 1943, for crematorium II: ibid., p. 307; Plan 109/15 of Huta firm of September 24, 1943, for crematoria II and III: ibid., p. 327; Plan 109/16A of Huta firm of October 9, 1943, for crematoria II and III: ibid., p. 328.

[762] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 55), p. 60.

[763] Note of SS-Untersturmführer Wolter of November 27, 1942. RGVA, 502-1-313, p. 65.

[764] Report no. 1 referring to construction work done on the crematoria and drawn up on 23 January 1943 by Bischoff for Kammler. RGVA, 502-1-313, pp. 54f.

[765] Topf, *Arbeits-Bescheinigung* of Messing for March 15-21, 1943. APMO, BW 30/31, p. 25.

[766] According to plan 1311 of May 14, 1942, which on November 27 was still in force. Cf. J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 9), p. 294.

[767] Construction Report for October 1942. RGVA, 502-1-24, p. 86.

[768] Letter of October 14, 1942, from Bischoff to the firm Huta. RGVA, 502-1-313, p. 112.

[769] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 9), p. 284.

[770] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 55), p. 60.

[771] Ibid., p. 34.

[772] The morgue of the crematorium.

[773] RGVA, 502-1-336, page number illegible.

[774] *Arbeits-Bescheinigung* of Messing for the week March 8-14, 1943. APMO, AuII-BW 30/31, p. 26.

[775] D. Czech, op. cit. (note 54), indicates erroneously the date of March 13th (p. 440).

[776] Regarding this Provan writes: "The Pressac date for the beginning of gassing at Krematorium 2 is about the middle of March, 1943, so this would be the latest date for the 'installation' of introduction holes" (pp. 18f.).

[777] "Protokolle des Todes," *Der Spiegel*, 40/1993, p. 162. The passage cited by Provan is in English translation on p. 4.

[778] Trial of Höss, vol. 2, pp. 99f.

[779] RGVA, 502-1-295, p. 63.

[780] APMO, BW 1/31/162, pp. 328-328a.

[781] The trial of Höss, vol. 11, p. 86.

[782] The trial of Höss, vol. 11, cross-examination of Henryk Tauber of May 24, 1945, pp. 129f.

[783] “Za,” literally “behind.”

[784] Together with the Topf engineers Kurt Prüfer and Fritz Sander, Schultze had been abducted by the Soviets and interrogated by the KGB. Sander died already at the beginning of the interrogation following a heart attack, Prüfer died a few years later following a brain hemorrhage. The value of confessions gained by the KGB with such interrogation methods is close to zero. See Jürgen Graf, “Anatomie der sowjetischen Befragung der Topf-Ingenieure,” *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, 6(4) (2002), pp. 398-421. Editor’s remark.

[785] R. Kammerer, A. Solms (ed.), op. cit. (note 2), pp. 27f.; G. Rudolf, op. cit. (note 71), p. 89 (German), op. cit. (note 2), p. 126f. (Engl.).

[786] Measurement of the author. Pressac publishes 5 photographs showing the same hole, but the diameter he gives is erroneous (25 cm). J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 9), p. 365.

[787] Measurement by the author of the ruins of Crematorium III.

[788] See the Topf plan D 59366 of March 10, 1942, “Schnitt b-b” where one reads: “These openings are located above the center of each oven.” J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 55), document 15 (plate).

[789] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 9), p. 367.

[790] The second hole in the attic of the furnace room is too indistinct to judge how much it has been damaged. Moreover, the damage has been caused by the collapse of the attic onto a supporting pillar.

[791] J.-C-Pressac, op. cit. (note 9), p. 338.

[792] , Clara Giua-Lollini, *Dizionario di chimica generale e industriale*, UTET, Torino 1949, vol. II, under the headword “Esplosivi,” p.178.

[793] AGK, NTN, 93, p. 29.

[794] Ibid., p. 45.

[795] Ibid., p. 30.

[796] Ibid., p. 72.

[797] Photographs of two of these shutters have been published by Pressac, op. cit. (note 9), p. 487, where they are called “galvanized sheet coverings.”

[798] “18.2.43. Nr. 83. [...] 50 Stick (sic) Blechsiebe 7 x 18 cm. Liefertermin 17.2.43.” Trial of Höss, vol. 11, p. 83.

[799] Trial of Höss, vol. 11, p. 45.

[800] J.-C-Pressac, op. cit. (note 9), p. 487.

[801] Israel Gutman, Michael Berenbaum (eds.), Indiana University Press, Bloomington and Indianapolis 1994, p. 167.

[802] G. Rudolf mentions in his expert report that Australian revisionist Fredrick Toben broke off one of these bars in spring 1997 in a failed attempt to bend it back; German ed.: op. cit. (note 71), note 241, p. 228; Engl. ed.: op. cit. (note 2), note 262, p. 125.

- [803] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 9), p. 229, caption for l document 46.
- [804] *The Pelt Report*, expert report introduced during the trial, op. cit. (note 4), p. 295.
- [805] D. Czech, op. cit. (note 54), p. 995.
- [806] The relative plan 4287 of September 21, 1944, is titled “*Ausbau des alten Krematorium. Luftschutzbunker für SS Revier mit einem Operationsraum*” (Conversion of the old crematorium. Air-raid shelter for SS hospital with a surgery room). RGVA, 502-2-147, p. 20.
- [807] RGVA, 502-1-401, p. 37.
- [808] Trial of Höss, vol. 11, p. 82.
- [809] Order 323 of April 16, 1943, Trial of Höss, vol. 11, p. 92. Other references on pages 84 (“4 gas-tight doors”), 90 (“gas tight doors”),
- [810] Trial of Höss, vol. 11, p. 97.
- [811] AGK, NTN, 107, p. 467-523.
- [812] In this deposition Kula said that the columns had a height of 2.5 meters, since he believed that the ceiling of Morgue 1 had a height of only 2 meters. Ibid., p. 498.
- [813] Trial of Höss, vol. 2, p. 83.
- [814] First published as “Die Einfüllöffnungen für Zyklon B – Teil 1: Die Decke der Leichenhalle von Krematorium I in Auschwitz,” *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, 8(3) (2004), pp. 267-274; translated by Henry Gardner; first Engl. publication as “The Openings for the Introduction of Zyklon B – Part 1: The Roof of the Morgue of Crematorium I at Auschwitz” in: *The Revisionist* 2(4) (2004), pp. 411-419, slightly revised version.
- Letter from SS-Sturmbannführer Bischoff to Central Construction Office of October 17, 1944. RGVA, 502-2-147, p. 124.
- [815] RGVA, 502-1-401, p. 34.
- [816] RGVA, 502-2-147, p. 20. Cfr. J.-C. Pressac, *Auschwitz: Technique and operation of the gas chambers*. The Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, New York 1989, p. 156 (<http://holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/pressac/technique-and-operation/pressac0156.shtml>).
- [817] Letter from SS-Sturmbannführer Bischoff to Central Construction Office of October 17, 1944. RGVA, 502-2-147, p. 124.
- [818] RGVA, 502-2-147, p. 125.
- [819] RGVA, 502-2-147, pp. 126-126a.
- [820] RGVA, 502-2-147, p. 122.
- [821] RGVA, 502-2-146, p. 21. Cf. document 1.
- [822] “Aussage von Stanisław Jankowski (Alter Feinsilber),” in: *Inmitten des grauenvollen Verbrechens. Handschriften von Mitgliedern des Sonderkommandos, Hefte von Auschwitz, Sonderheft I*, Verlag des Staatlichen Auschwitz-Birkenau Museums,

1972, p. 42.

[823] Interrogation report, Hans Stark, Cologne, April 23, 1959. ZStL, Ref.: AR-Z 37/58 SB6, p. 947.

[824] "Erinnerungen von Pery Broad," in: *Hefte von Auschwitz*, Wydawnictwo Państwowego Muzeum w Oświęcimiu, 9, 1966, p. 31.

[825] F. Müller, *Sonderbehandlung. Drei Jahre in den Krematorien und Gaskammern von Auschwitz*. Verlag Steinhausen, Munich 1979, p. 62.

[826] AGK, NTN, 105, pp. 110-111.

[827] APMO, Oświadczenia, t. 74, pp. 6f.

[828] RGVA, 502-1-401, p. 34.

[829] RGVA, 502-2-147, p. 12a.

[830] RGVA, 502-1-401, p. 34.

[831] It would have found a logical place in the small vestibule of the lock (*Schleuse*) which remained without a door and where there is only a light wooden door today.

[832] The present door even has a window. Cf. document 14.

[833] APMO, sygn. 5149. Cf. document 6.

[834] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 3), p. 149.

[835] APMO, Oświadczenia, t. 96, p. 59.

[836] Earlier, the narrator had spoken of the reconstruction of the chimney of crematorium I that was carried out between late 1946 and early 1947.

[837] The small wooden casings set in the ceiling panels of the morgue

[838] "Kostenüberschlag zum Ausbau des alten Krematoriums als Luftschutzbunker für SS-Revier mit einem Operationsraum im K.L. Auschwitz O/S – BW 98 M," RGVA, 502-2-147, p. 126.

[839] The left-most room in Ill. 3-5, which originally served as a laying-out chamber and in which today the Kori oil-fired oven from the crematorium at Trzebinia is preserved, is not open to tourists. I have therefore been unable to ascertain whether its ceiling shows traces of any further openings.

[840] C. Mattogno, *Auschwitz: Crematorium I*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2005, docs. 2 and 9; RGVA, 502-1-327, pp. 191f., 502-1-312, p. 111.

[841] D. Keren, J. McCarthy, H.W. Mazal, "The Ruins of the Gas Chambers: A Forensic Investigation of Crematoriums at Auschwitz I and Auschwitz-Birkenau," in: *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, vol. 9, n. 1, spring 2004, pp. 97-99.

[842] Ibid., p. 98.

[843] Ibid., figure 31 on p. 92.

[844] Ibid., p. 97.

[845] F. Piper, "Gas Chambers and Crematoria," in: Israel Gutman, Michael Berenbaum (eds.), *Anatomy of the Auschwitz Death Camp*, Indiana University Press,

Bloomington/Indianapolis, 1994, p. 177 note 16: “When crematorium I was converted into an air-raid shelter, the openings were bricked up.”

[846] “A Study of the Cyanide Compounds Content in the Walls of the Gas Chambers in the Former Auschwitz and Birkenau Concentration Camps,” *Z Zagadnień Nauk Sądowych*, z. XXX, 1994, pp. 17-27.

[847] Ibid., table III on p. 23.

[848] Cf. Rudolf’s critique “Polish Pseudo-Scientists“ in this volume, starting at page 45.

[849] Fred A. Leuchter, *An Engineering Report on the Alleged Execution Gas Chambers at Auschwitz, Birkenau and Majdanek, Poland*. Fred A. Leuchter, Associates, Boston, Massachusetts, 1988; see also: Fred A. Leuchter, Robert Faurisson, Germar Rudolf, *The Leuchter Reports. Critical Edition*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2005, pp. 58, 73f.

[850] In order, the values are as follows: 1.9, 1.3, 1.4, 1.3, 7.9, 1.1 mg/kg.

[851] E. Aynat, “Neither Trace nor Proof: The Seven Auschwitz ‘Gassing’ Sites According to Jean-Claude Pressac,” *Journal of Historical Review* 11(2) (1991), pp. 177-206, here p. 182.

[852] See. G. Rudolf, *The Rudolf Report*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003, pp. 253, 258.

[853] First published as “Die Einfüllöffnungen für Zyklon B – Teil 2: Die Decke der Leichenhalle von Krematorium I in Auschwitz,” *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsforschung*, 8(3) (2004), pp. 275-290; translated by Henry Gardner; first Engl. publication as “The Openings for the Introduction of Zyklon B – Part 2: The Roof of Morgue 1 of Crematorium II at Birkenau” in: *The Revisionist* 2(4) (2004), pp. 420-436, slightly revised version.

Holocaust and Genocide Studies, 9(1), spring 2004, pp. 68-103.

[854] See chapter 2 of this contribution.

[855] C.D. Provan, “No Holes? No Holocaust? A Study of the Holes in the Roof of Morgue 1 of Krematorium 2 at Birkenau.” Printed by: Zimmer Printing, 410 West Main Street, Monongahela, PA 15063. © 2000 by Charles D. Provan; online: www.revisingrevisionism.com.

[856] It is the English translation of the French translation published by Pressac in: *Auschwitz: Technique and operation of the gas chambers*, Beate Klarsfeld Foundation, New York 1989, pp. 481-502 (<http://holocaust-history.org/auschwitz/pressac/technique-and-operation/pressac0481.shtml> ff.).

[857] Höss trial, vol. 11, interrogation of Henryk Tauber on May 24, 1945, pp. 129f.

[858] “Za,” literally “behind.”

[859] Statement by H. Tauber on February 27, 1945. GARF, 7021-108-13, p. 5.

[860] G. Greif has limited himself to interviews with seven self-styled survivors

of the so-called “Sonderkommando,” asking them banal questions, which show his very vague knowledge of the history of the camp. As a case in point, this “expert” did not even ask his partners how many Zyklon B holes there were!

[861] G. Greif, *Wir weinten tränenlos... Augenzeugenberichte der jüdischen “Sonderkommandos” in Auschwitz*, Böhlau Verlag, Cologne/Weimar/Vienna 1985, p. 237.

[862] See p. 288 of this book.

[863] The term “schub” is usually used in connection with drawers in German.

[864] RGVA, 502-2-54, p. 79.

[865] Pressac has noted that drawing 2197 of crematorium II, dated March 19, 1943, “indicates that morgue 1 had 16 lamps and 3 taps and morgue 2, 10 lamps and 5 taps,” whereas the inventory attributes 5 taps to morgue 1 and 3 to morgue 2, therefore the two lines are inverted; hence, he ascribes an analogous inversion also to the 4 wire mesh introduction devices and to the 4 wooden covers, which would thus belong to morgue 1. (J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 4), pp. 430 and 231). But as the number of lamps is correct for each one of the two morgues, nothing proves that the lines referring to the 4 wire mesh introduction devices and to the 4 wooden covers have been inverted; therefore, the irrefutable fact remains that these objects are attributed to morgue 2.

[866] See chapter 2.7.2. The testimony of Michał Kula,” starting on p. 303 of this volume.

[867] Höss trial, vol. 11, interrogation of Henryk Tauber on May 24, 1945, p. 139.

[868] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 4), p. 340. Cf. Ill. 2.

[869] The first analyses of this photo were made by Jean-Marie Boisdefeu (*La controvers sur l’extermination des Juifs par les Allemands*, vol. 1, Vrij Historisch Onderzoek, Berchem 1994, p. 168) and G. Rudolf (*Das Rudolf Gutachten*, 2nd ed., Castle Hill Publishers, Hastings 2001, p. 79; Engl.: *The Rudolf Report*, Theses & Dissertations Press, Chicago 2003, p. 113-116), though relying on low quality reproductions of this photo.

[870] Data taken from the drawings of crematorium II published by J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 4), pp. 286 and 325.

[871] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 4), pp. 268f.

[872] Ibid., p. 329. The windows of the crematorium thus stood at hardly 40 cm above the surface of the layer of sand, which is confirmed by the photograph from the Kamann series of crematorium II in the summer of 1943. Cf. following section.

[873] See chapter 2.6. The Arguments of Pressac and Van Pelt,” starting on p. 298 of this volume.

[874] The camera stood a little distance above the level of the morgue and this explains the fact that the two objects also had a rounded top.

[875] Mission 60 PR/694 60 SQ. Can F 5367. Exposure 3185, 3186. NA.

- [876] J.C. Zimmerman, *Holocaust Denial. Demographics, Testimonies and Ideologies*. University Press, Lanham, New York, Oxford 2000, p. 243; see my contribution “An Accountant Poses as Cremation Expert,” starting on p. 87 of the present book.
- [877] According to M. Nyiszli, two SS men were assigned to the alleged gassings: *Auschwitz. A Doctor’s Eyewitness Account*. Fawcett Crest, New York 1961, p. 45; *Im Jenseits der Menschlichkeit. Ein Gerichtsmediziner in Auschwitz*, Dietz Verlag, Berlin 1992, p. 36.
- [878] See p. 304 in this volume.
- [879] See Ill. 2, p. 332.
- [880] RGVA, 502-1-229, p.11.
- [881] RGVA, 502-1-229, pp. 12f.
- [882] RGVA, 502-1-229, p. 14.
- [883] RGVA, 502-1-313, p. 4.
- [884] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 4), p. 341; see Ill. 1 on p. 317.
- [885] See p. 291 of this volume.
- [886] See p. 306 of this volume.
- [887] See Ill. 10ff., p. 324ff.
- [888] Chapter, 2.7.3., starting on p. 307.
- [889] See p. 309.
- [890] R.J. van Pelt, *The Case for Auschwitz. Evidence from the Irving Trial*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington/Indianapolis 2002, p. 208.
- [891] See Ill. 32-34, pp. 338-340 in this volume.
- [892] See pp. 309f. of this volume.
- [893] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 4), p. 265.
- [894] See Ill. 23-28 on pp. 333-335 of this volume.
- [895] R.J. van Pelt, *Pelt Report*, expert report introduced in the trial of David John Cawdell Irving vs. (1) Penguin Books Limited, (2) Deborah E. Lipstadt, Queen’s Bench Division, Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London, ref. 1996 I. No. 113., p. 295; *The Case for Auschwitz*, op. cit. (note 38), p. 406.
- [896] See chapter 2.7.7. on p. 313 in this volume.
- [897] See chapter 3 of the present article.
- [898] “The ‘Gas Testers’ of Auschwitz,” in: *The Revisionist*, 2(2) (2004), pp. 140-154.
- [899] See Ill. 29 on p. 336 of this volume.
- [900] Carlo Mattogno, “The Morgues of the Crematoria at Birkenau in the Light of Documents,” *TR* 2(3) (2004), pp. 276-278.
- [901] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (note 4), p. 488.
- [902] *Ibid.*, p. 312.

-
- [1] D. Keren, J. McCarthy, H.W. Mazal, op. cit. (footnote 1), S. 79.
- [2] Kamann-Serie, APMO Negativ Nr. 20995/504.
- [3] J.-C. Pressac, op. cit. (footnote 4), photo 11, p. 337.
- [4] From: C.D. Provan, *No Holes? No Holocaust? A Study of the Holes in the Roof of Leichenkeller 1 of Krematorium 2 at Birkenau*, Zimmer Printing, 410 West Main Street, Monongahela, PA 15063, p. 33.
- [5] Kamann series, January 1943. APMO, Negativ Nr. 20995/506.
- [6] NA, Mission 60 PR/694 60 SQ. Can F 5367. Exposure 3185f., here 3185.
- [7] NA, Mission 60 PRS/462 60 SQ. Can D 1508. Exposure 3055.
- [8] NA, Mission 15 SG/995 5PG. Can D 1535. Exposure 4018.
- [9] Daniel Keren et al., op. cit. (footnote 1), p. 85.